Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-024
Tuesday
5 February 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-024 *5 February 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Churkin Briefs Media on Gulf, Baltics, Korea 1
Saddam's Replies 'Not Constructive' *[Moscow International]* 1
Korean Events 'Disquieting' *[TASS]* 1
Cites Discussion of Baltic Events *[TASS]* 1
Comments Further on Baltics *[TASS]* 2
Alleged 'Double Dealing' in Mideast Rejected *[TASS]* 3
U.S. UN Delegate Cited on Ties, Human Rights *[TASS]* 3
Instability Caused by 'Pigmy States' Criticized *[PRAVDA 2 Feb]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Admiral's Statement on Gulf Weaponry Viewed *[TASS]* 6
U.S. Envoy Tours Possible Consular Sites *[TASS]* 6
Ministry Denies Ceding Bering Territories to U.S. *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]* 6

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Welcomes DPRK-Japan Talks on Relations *[2 Feb]* 7
Talks Urged To Solve Korean Nuclear Issue *[Moscow International]* 7
Blackout Exercise Reported in Pyongyang *[Moscow International]* 8

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for U.S.-Philippines Talks Viewed *[Moscow International]* 8
Bomb Threat Reported at Manila Aeroflot Office *[TASS]* 9

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov Interviewed Prior to Tehran Visit *[TASS]* 9
Military Official Describes UN Peacekeeping Role *[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]* 9
Iraqi Envoy Speaks on U.S. 'Imperialism' in Gulf *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Feb]* 10
Syrian Information Minister Explains Gulf Stance *[Moscow International]* 11
Defense Official Denies Supplying Arms to Iraq *[Berlin DER MORGEN 1 Feb]* 12
International Relations Committee Discusses War *[TASS]* 12
Soviet Officials Hold Talks on Persian Gulf War 13
Yazov Meets With Syrian Minister *[TASS]* 13
Dzasokhov Receives Mideast Envoys *[TASS]* 13
Various Reactions to War in Gulf Reported 13
Soviet Attitudes Explored *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 13
Coalition's Aims Questioned *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Jan]* 14
'No End to Madness' Seen *[Moscow International]* 16
Reports Mark India's Independence Anniversary 17
Indian Envoy Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]* 17
Gorbachev Sends Greetings *[PRAVDA 26 Jan]* 19
Indian Minister Meets Petrovskiy on Gulf 22 Jan *[Delhi Radio]* 19

West Europe

Chancellor Kohl Speaks on Relations with USSR *[IZVESTIYA 1 Feb]* 19
Official Interviewed on Two-Plus-Four Ratification
[Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG 3 Feb] 19
German Criticism of Domestic Policy Rejected *[PRAVDA 5 Feb]* 20
MiG-27 Crashes Near German Village 31 Jan *[TASS]* 20
Gorbachev Greets Italian Communist Party Leader *[TASS]* 21

Latin America & Caribbean

Deputy Ends Visit to Cuba; Views Cooperation *[TASS]* 21
Castro's 'Loathsome' Leadership Cited for Problems
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Feb] 21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Leaders Comment on Federation Council Talks *[TASS]* 22
Meeting Analyzed *[TASS]* 22
CPSU Members Address Joint Party Plenum 23
Prokofyev Views Opposition *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 23
Ukraine's Gurenko Addresses Plenum *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 24
Vilnius Communist Demands Action *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 25
Kalinina on Threats of Capitalism *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 26
Zhiganov Supports Decrees *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 27
Melnikov Streeses Need for Action *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 28
Prokofyev Holds News Conference on Plenum Results *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Radio Rossii Dropped From Moscow First Program *[Moscow TV]* 29
More on Transmission Changes *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Broadcast Time Cut 50 Percent *[Radio Rossii]* 29
To Broadcast on Third Program *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Newspaper Editors Deplore Radio Rossii Ruling *[Moscow Radio]* 30
'Vzglyad' Workers Seek Action Against Officials *[TASS]* 30
Gosteleradio Chiefs Answer Questions *[Moscow TV]* 30

Economic

Stankevich Denies Moscow Price Rise Decision *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Bank Note Deferred Procedure Outlined *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* 46
Cabinet Debates Exchange *[IZVESTIYA 1 Feb]* 46
Distribution of Imported Goods Hampered *[Moscow TV]* 47
Turkmen KGB Battles Economic Crime *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 28 Dec]* 47

Scientific

Soyuz-7-Cosmos 1686 Changes Trajectory *[Moscow TV]* 49
Spokesman Gives Details on Space Station Demise *[TASS]* 49
More on Salyut-7 *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 49
'Salyut-7' Return to Earth Reviewed *[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]* 50
Space Debris Contaminates Kazakh Pastures *[PRAVDA 30 Jan]* 51

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Meets With Lithuanian Party Leader *[TASS]* 52
Party Official Recounts Meeting *[Radio Vilnius]* 52

Plebiscite on Lithuania's Future Begins *[TASS]* 52
Gorbachev Decrees Poll Invalid *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Council Issues Appeal on Plebiscite *[Radio Vilnius]* 54
Wording of Plebiscite Questioned *[TASS]* 54
Committee Sees Poll as 'Swindle' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Feb]* 54
Lithuanians Divided on Poll *[PRAVDA 1 Feb]* 54
Lithuanian Supreme Council Session 4 Feb *[Radio Vilnius]* 55
Troops Still at Vilnius Radio, TV Center *[Vilnius International]* 57
Moscow Proposes Talks *[Vilnius International]* 57
Officials on TV Tower Incident *[Moscow TV]* 57
Moscow TV Discussion on Baltics Violence 57
Military Patrol Incidents in Vilnius Reported *[Radio Vilnius]* 59
Bickauskas on Talks With USSR Delegation *[Vilnius International]* 60
Landsbergis Receives Shchit Delegation *[Radio Vilnius]* 60
Landsbergis Receives Polish Delegation *[Warsaw PAP]* 60
USSR Colonel on Army Draft in Lithuania *[Radio Vilnius]* 60
Damage in Lithuania Estimated at $57 Million *[AFP]* 61
Sajudis Allegedly Persecuting Opponents *[Moscow TV]* 61
No Orders For Joint Patrols In Latvia *[Riga Radio]* 61
'No Information' on Latvian Radio, TV Occupation *[Riga Radio]* 61
Cameraman Injured in OMON Attack Dies *[Radio Vilnius]* 61
Investigation of TV Reporter Attack Continues *[TASS]* 61
Ivans Calls for Pressure on World Public Opinion *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Feb]* 62
Aluksne Militia Backs Latvian Leaders *[Riga Radio]* 62
Clashes in Latvian Capital Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 62
Latvia's Equal Rights Group Boycotts Legislature *[Moscow TV]* 63
Equal Rights Group Warns Against Nationalism *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 18 Jan]* 63
Latvian Salvation Committee on Assuming Power *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17 Jan]* 64
Riga Stock Market Exchange Opens *[Moscow International]* 65
Latvia, Estonia Committees Reject Referendum *[Riga Radio]* 65
Estonia To Hold Referendum 3 March *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Estonian Police, Militia To Merge 1 March *[Moscow TV]* 65
Tallinn Official on Militia Situation *[Tallinn Radio]* 65
Intermovement Congress Attacks Perestroyka *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Four Reported Detained in Tallinn Murder Case *[Stockholm Radio]* 66
Estonian Representative in Appointed to RSFSR *[Tallinn Radio]* 66

RSFSR

Deputies Urge Gorbachev, Pavlov To Resign *[Radio Rossii]* 66
RSFSR Protests Move To Switch Radio Rossii *[Radio Rossii]* 66
Media Ministry Statement *[TASS]* 67
Media Head Speaks on Changes *[Radio Rossii]* 67
Broadcasting Chiefs View Changes *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Editors Call for 'New Mass Media' *[Radio Rossii]* 68
Commentary on Radio Restrictions *[Radio Rossii]* 68
Russian TV Chief Hopes for 31 Mar Start *[Moscow TV]* 69
Electronic 'Bugging' of Supreme Soviet Denied *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Feb]* 69
Yeltsin Chairs Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Feb]* 69
Shakhay Addresses Supreme Soviet 1 Feb *[Moscow TV]* 70
Yeltsin Appeals to Russians in Baltics *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 15 Jan]* 72
Moscow Center Takes Poll on Army Patrols *[Radio Rossii]* 72
Soviet Protests Delay in Komissarov Post *[Radio Rossii]* 72

Western Republics

Official Assured of Ukraine Continuing in UN *[TASS]* 73
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Agenda Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Feb]* 73
Chernobyl AES Explosion Rumors Quelled *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 30 Jan]* 74
Lvov Communist Secretary on Party in Opposition *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 Jan]* 74
Newspaper Assesses Ukrainian Student Movement
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jan] 77

Caucasus

Armenians Call for End to Azerbaijan Conflict *[TASS]* 80
Armenians Urge Azerbaijanis for Peace in NKAO *[Baku Radio]* 80
Economic, Ethnic 'Tension' in Stepanakert Viewed *[TASS]* 81
Armenian Supreme Soviet Rejects Decree on Patrols *[Yerevan Radio]* 81
Armenian, Soviet Army Officials Negotiating Draft *[Yerevan International]* 81
Armenian-American Named to Supreme Soviet Post *[Yerevan International]* 82
Armenian TV Becomes 'Full Associate' of CNN *[ARMENPRES]* 82
Azerbaijani Seeks Republic-Center Balance *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jan]* 82
Ossetian Deputy, Georgian Extremists Arrested *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Feb]* 84
Georgian Government Law To Trim Soviet Role *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]* 84
Gamsakhurdia Says Armed Patrols Unacceptable *[Budapest NEPSZAVA 1 Feb]* 85
Paper Views Georgian Moves on Draft, Government *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Feb]* 85
Georgian Body Leader Disputes 'Vremya' Report *[Moscow TV]* 86
'Closed' Georgian Paper To Reopen With New Name
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jan] 86
Georgia's Supreme Soviet Newspaper Renamed *[Tbilisi Radio]* 87
Transcaucasus 'Mothers' Rally' on Conscript Life *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jan]* 87

Central Asia

'Vremya' Carries Profile of Kirghiz President *[Moscow TV]* 87
Masaliyev Wants Kyrgyzstan's Old Name Restored *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]* 87
BAYKONUR Newspaper Launched in Leninsk *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 88

Churkin Briefs Media on Gulf, Baltics, Korea

Saddam's Replies 'Not Constructive'

LD0402173391 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov will leave for Tehran on Tuesday for consultations with parties concerned in the Gulf war, Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said on Monday. He described as very positive the offer by the Iranian President Rafsanjani to meet the Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn to discuss how to restore peace.

The spokesman also said President Mikhail Gorbachev had received two replies to messages he had sent to Saddam Husayn, but the replies were not constructive. The spokesman noted that the Soviet position on the war had not changed, although he said Moscow was afraid the situation might get completely out of control.

Meanwhile the United States reacted coolly to that offer by the Iranian president to mediate an end to the Gulf war, stressing that an Iraqi pullout from Kuwait was the only path to peace.

Korean Events 'Disquieting'

LD0402174891 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin called journalists' attention at a briefing today to the situation on the Korean peninsula where South Korea recently put on full alert its Armed Forces.

Declaring full alert, South Korea referred to "the growing threat of an attack" and "possible provocations" by North Korea as a result of the spreading war in the Gulf, Churkin said.

According to press reports, the spokesman continued, Pyongyang conducted blackout exercises (the fourth this year) to prepare for war.

According to information received from North Korea, machine-gun bursts aimed at North Korea were registered in the Demilitarised Zone on February 2, he added.

Commenting on these reports, Churkin said: "This news from Korea is disquieting. It is regrettable that these events are taking place along with some positive changes in inter-Korean relations, including regular meetings between the North and South Korean prime ministers, who discuss military and political detente on the peninsula".

"It is to be hoped that the two Korean sides will display restraint and calm and will continue the dialogue aimed at creating an atmosphere of trust between Democratic Korea and the Republic of Korea."

Cites Discussion of Baltic Events

LD0402182191 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev, Igor Peskov, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—"The Soviet Federation Council on Friday discussed the situation in the Baltics. The discussion of recent events in Lithuania and Latvia was thorough and unbiased. The council analysed the reasons for the conflict," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

At correspondents' request, Churkin spoke on President Mikhail Gorbachev's decision to set up a negotiating mechanism to discuss the whole range of political, social and economic issues with Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Churkin said that First Deputy Prime Ministers Vladimir Velichko and Vitaliy Doguzhiyev and Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov had been appointed to head delegations comprising competent specialists from the Soviet Parliament, the State Planning Committee, the Defence Ministry, the Interior Ministry and the Foreign Ministry.

Speakers at the Federation Council session noted that anti-constitutional acts adopted in the Baltic republics and the violation of human rights of many citizens provoked confrontation and resulted in an explosion, Churkin said.

The Federation Council supported the Soviet president's statement of January 22 on absolute inadmissibility of the use of military force to resolve political problems and on the need to eliminate the sources of the conflict on a mutually acceptable basis and restore constitutional order, Churkin said.

A consensus has been reached, as this is the only way to eliminate the danger of sharpening disputes and outbursts of violence and ensure a return to normal life, he said.

Participants noted that the only right way is by means of talks, and it has not been studied sufficiently. Unfortunately, the dialogue with Baltic republics was sporadic and was not carried through to a logical end. Only several consultative meetings were held. That is why the decision was taken to hold talks on a permanent basis, Churkin said.

Analysing the present situation, speakers stressed that the country is living through the difficult process of society's harmonisation, ethnic relations are being established with great difficulties against this background, and the sweeping transformation of the Soviet Federation is taking place.

It must be clear to all that no political or nationality changes in society will be successful if political, social and other rights of citizens are trampled underfoot, and ethnic discrimination is practiced.

Speakers called on the leaders of the Baltic republics to responsibly analyse the present situation and to avoid statements which could fan up passions.

This is also true of the negative "internationalisation" of events in the Baltics when foreign states are sometimes openly invited to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union.

During the discussion, Council of the Federation members proposed several urgent measures to overcome the political and constitutional crisis, Churkin continued.

They include the establishment of conciliation commissions consisting of various political groups, roundtables with the participation of all interested parties and the thorough and unbiased legal examination of laws adopted in the Baltics.

It was stressed that all cases of the use of arms must be thoroughly investigated and assessed according to law. Law-breakers must be punished.

The Soviet president, the all-Union parliament and the government are closely following developments in the Baltic republics and are doing their best to normalise the situation there as soon as possible, Churkin concluded.

Comments Further on Baltics

LD0402203991 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—"The Soviet Federation Council on Friday [1 February] discussed the situation in the Baltics. The council supported the Soviet president's statement of January 22 on absolute inadmissibility of the use of military force to resolve political problems and on the need to eliminate the sources of the conflict on a mutually acceptable basis and restore constitutional order," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

At correspondent's request, Churkin spoke on President Mikhail Gorbachev's decision to set up a negotiating mechanism to discuss the whole range of political, social and economic issues with Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

The decision was taken to hold talks not sporadically, but on a permanent basis, Churkin said.

Speakers called on the leaders of the Baltic republics to responsibly analyse the present situation and to avoid statements which could fan up passions.

This is also true of the negative "internationalisation" of events in the Baltics when foreign states are sometimes openly invited to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union, the spokesman said.

It was stressed that all cases of the use of arms must be thoroughly investigated and assessed according to law. Law-breakers must be punished, Churkin said.

Speaking about legal expertise on laws adopted in the Baltics, Churkin said the Soviet Union has a sufficient number of its "own lawyers and specialists who could make a competent conclusion on the issues".

About the establishment of diplomatic relations between Iceland and Lithuania, Churkin noted that the Soviet side "had contacts on the issue with Iceland officials in Moscow". He said the sides only stated the fact.

Churkin said that six Soviet journalists caught by the war in Iraq, recently arrived in Iran. On February 3, they left Bakhtaran for the Astara border point. According to the Soviet Foreign Ministry, they were expected to cross the border today.

The spokesman confirmed that the Soviet side had received an official answer from Iraq to two appeals by President Mikhail Gorbachev to President Saddam Husayn. Churkin said the reply "was not constructive".

Churkin noted that the Soviet Union maintained contacts with other countries in connection with the Gulf war. On Sunday, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov will leave for Tehran. "Recently, Tehran has become the site of intense meetings connected with the Gulf crisis," Churkin said.

"President Rafsanjani told a news conference recently that he was ready to meet the Iraqi president. We have no detailed account of all ideas referred to by the Iranian president in his statement at the news conference. But we welcome his idea of meeting the Iraqi president, proceeding from the Iranian president's statement that they should discuss Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait," Churkin said.

Churkin refused to elaborate on the Soviet deputy foreign minister's talks with the Iraqi leadership, before Belonogov returns home.

Commenting on the political statement by the plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission, Churkin said the Soviet Foreign Ministry will "pay great attention to its recommendations" on measures to stop the Gulf war. At the same time, he said that the statement "contains nothing that contradicts the well-known Soviet position".

Asked about new proposals by President of South Africa Frederik de Klerk to dismantle the apartheid system in the country, Churkin said "we certainly welcome all moves aimed to dismantle apartheid".

Alleged 'Double Dealing' in Mideast Rejected

LD0402212191 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—Despite common sense and the development of international relations over the past few years, some Western mass media continue accusing the Soviet Union of "double dealing" in the Middle East, alleging violations by Moscow of U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq's aggression against Kuwait.

New details about "Soviet aid to Iraq" are growing more fantastic with each day. The french conservative press was especially assiduous in discrediting the Soviet Union over the past few days.

The Paris-based LE FIGARO newspaper reported today that Iraq receives from Moscow data enabling Baghdad to make more precise launchings of scuds, as well as information about the time when U.S. intelligence satellites pass over the Arabian peninsula, which helps Iraqi troops to camouflage their weapons in time.

The French magazine L'EVENEMENT recently announced that Soviet generals support the Iraqi position and, therefore, there are apprehensions that the Soviet Union does not observe the embargo on the delivery to the Hussayn regime of spares to combat materiel.

All these concoctions are given with references to unidentified sources in the CIA, some U.S. experts and even White House representatives.

Even clear-cut statements by U.S. Defence Secretary Rick Cheney do not stop the flood of concoctions about the Soviet position on the Gulf War. Cheney refuted two times reports about Soviet violations of U.N. Security Council Resolutions over the past ten days.

In an interview with the NBC TV company, Cheney said that he was aware of such reports and he had no grounds to believe them. He added that the Soviet Union remains true to its word.

Cheney noted on February 3 that the position of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev concerning the war is more responsible than anybody could suppose several years ago.

The Soviet support for U.N. Security Council resolutions, readiness to withdraw advisers and readiness to stop arms suppplies to Iraq are a very important part of the hitherto successful strategy, he stressed.

The new wave of concoctions about the Soviet position on the Gulf war is evidently not only a desire of some pressmen to call attention of the readers to sensational canards.

The reason obviously also lies in increased activities by conservative circles in the West, which would like to breed mistrust between the USSR and the United States and reverse world developments to the cold war.

Indicative are also pronouncements by some Western military who hope that "the impressive demonstration of the U.S. military might" in the Gulf will make the Soviet Union review its position on disarmament issues and reject the talks on arms control.

U.S. UN Delegate Cited on Ties, Human Rights

LD0202155591 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 2 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva February 2 TASS—The durability of Soviet-American cooperation and true partnership between the two countries depend on the continuation of the perestroyka policy. There can be no real partnership, if the countries do not have common values, head of the U.S. delegation Kenneth Blackwell said at a session of the U.N. Commission for Human Rights.

He made a report on the next item of the agenda of the session—the right of nations to self-determination.

According to Blackwell, reforms are the best way to the improvement of Soviet-American relations. The Soviet Union is the first to be interested in the support for the rejuvenation processes. We are sure that the use of force in the Baltic region runs counter to the fundamentals of the policy of perestroyka, glasnost and democratisation, he said. It is difficult to understand in what way one can resort to force, especially now, for suppressing the emerging democratic institutions, the head of the American delegation pointed out.

The United States continues to support the USSR in its adherence to principles, recorded in the Paris declaration of member states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Proceeding from this assumption, the U.S. believes that it is a peaceful dialogue and not force that is the only lawful means.

Blackwell pointed out that the upholding and putting into practice of the principle of free and general elections was one of the priority directions of the U.S. policy in the United Nations.

Instability Caused by 'Pigmy States' Criticized

PM0402093591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Yevgeniy Shashkov under the rubric "View from Moscow": "A Shack for 'Sovereigns'"]

[Text] Many foreign and some of our own mass media and individual politicians received the results of the Soviet-American meeting at foreign minister level held during the past week with unconcealed disappointment.

This reaction was, however, by no means evoked by a sense of grief that the next "summit" between the USSR and the United States would not take place at the set time. It is more likely that the fate of the meeting, which was scheduled to take place in February, does not worry them very much at all. They are concerned about something else. How is it possible, they have asked, for Baltic problems to have been discussed for more than five hours without the joint statement of the U.S. secretary of state and the Soviet minister on the reasons for the postponement of the summit making any allusion to them at all. This creates the impression that there are more important issues in the world. And it appears that there are. Both the ministers left not a shred of doubt about this.

In my opinion, the attempts to draw the leaders of major Western countries into a provocative "political lambada" around Lithuania looked rather curious from the very beginning of the events in Vilnius. A very old maneuver was used. I admit that it might have worked during the years of stagnation, when our country was behind the "iron curtain." However, given the current level of openness, not just highly impressionable members of the foreign press but also diplomats and politicians visiting the Baltic republics, who prefer to rely on sober analysis rather than emotions, were able to see for themselves what was actually happening in Vilnius and Riga. Is it really so strange that maneuvers of this kind now produce such rare and poor results? You will recall R. Reagan's favorite Russian proverb—"Trust but verify." It seems to me that the present administration is guided by this proverb also in respect of the Russian and Baltic leaders' false appeals.

If this is actually so, then, in my opinion, this approach is to be welcomed. Only in this way is it possible to separate the wheat from the chaff in our domestic political life at this time. No matter how sad this may be, we have already sunk so low that in the heat of the struggle certain forces are prepared to use even our foreign and military policy as a bargaining chip. This is no exaggeration. What other interpretation is there for the appeal of the leaders of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Russia to the United Nations to postpone the application of military sanctions against Iraq until the Lithuanian crisis has been settled? Is that not a blatant attempt to exploit the big international organization for their own political purposes. You can make whatever angry assessments you like of what happened in Vilnius, but it remains a purely domestic policy issue. Why try and stab our foreign policy in the back and undermine the world community's confidence in it?

Or was this perhaps an extravagant step to save the Landsbergis group. It seems to me that those who decided to take this step have still not realized that in succumbing to emotions they have committed a serious tactical error.

Tactical errors, as is known, very often turn into strategic fiascos; all because in our consciousness, although you may be a triple "democrat," elements of totalitarian thinking persist (and how could it be otherwise). This way of thinking leads to the assumption that if the powers that be do not desperately defend the existing order by force, it means that the center has lost its power and all that needs to be done is to lean on it. The forms of pressure that are applied may vary greatly—from inflammatory articles in the press to rallies. It is no accident that totalitarian thinking is regarded as a distortion of the normal train of thought, because it refuses to grasp that the center's motive for refraining from the use of force could be a desire for a gradual transition to democratic rule. By wrongly interpreting as the final collapse of central power the balanced steps toward such a transition, ultra-left extremists inevitably run into solid resistance from the center's laws, which have not been repealed by anyone and for whose enforcement strong-arm pressure is used throughout the world.

So there were serious grounds for the five-hour discussions on Baltic problems by the heads of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments. I anticipate indignant questions on the following lines: What business of J. Baker's are our internal affairs, did he have any right to discuss them? In my opinion he did. I have no idea, of course, what specifically J. Baker and A. Bessmertnykh talked about, but I believe that the USSR would never ask the United States or any other great power whether or not presidential rule, for example, was going to be introduced in a given region. However, it seems to me that the "Baltic factor" is evoking concern of a different, more serious order in the United States and also other Western countries. The national-state aspirations of these republics could provoke geopolitical competition among different "power centers." Furthermore, the introduction of new variables in the all-European security equation would enhance the difficulty of resolving it.

Naturally, this is not in the interest of either the West Europeans, or the USSR, or the United States. After all, how much effort was needed to create the atmosphere of East-West cooperation and mutual trust? And who can guarantee that the still relatively fragile foundations of Soviet-American cooperation will not crack under the impact of centrifugal aspirations and mounting national-state egoisms?

What guarantee is there that well-known U.S. futurologist John Nesbit's prediction that nationalism will be one of the main trends of the next millenium will not come true? After all, it could encompass not just the Soviet Union but also other countries and regions, for example Slovakia and Moravia which are part of Czechoslovakia, the Macedonians and Turks in Bulgaria, the Germans in Polish Silesia, and the Hungarians living in Romania. Yugoslavia is going through a serious political crisis right now as a result of the refusal of certain national and ethnic groups to subordinate themselves to the center.

Even in Western Europe not everything is as simple as it might seem at first glance. The attempts of Corsican nationalists to gain independence from France are not

subsiding (incidentally, this island was joined to France at approximately the same time as Lithuania became part of the Russian empire). Britain keeps tight control over Northern Ireland because if it goes, Scotland and possibly also Wales might follow suit. A movement for association with the Netherlands is afoot in the Flemish part of Belgium. I do not believe that the United States would react with enthusiasm to independence for the Hawaiian Islands, which were annexed during the Spanish-American war. There are quite a few problems with Quebec in Canada.

Where is a guarantee that, if they were appear on the political map, the new independent pigmy states would not turn at first into dictatorships, albeit small ones? After all, many countries in Europe are predisposed toward this by state heredity. It is a myth that they have always been quiet and democratic like "church choirboys." Fascist or semifascist dictatorships emerged in many states of this continent considerably earlier than in Germany. Let us recall—1923: a fascist coup in Bulgaria; 1926: A. Smetona become dictator of Lithuania. Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin were not the only dictators in the twenties and thirties. This virus afflicted prewar Europe, and especially the small countries which were formed during the recarving of the Old World after 1918. Pilsudski in Poland, Karl Ulmanis in Latvia, Cornelius Codreanu (and later Antonescu) in Romania, Horthy in Hungary, Pavelic in Croatia, Tiso in Slovakia, and so forth. Where is the guarantee that this tragic history will not repeat itself?

Many people are today dreaming about a well-appointed "all-European home," and on the "Common Market" side construction has actually begun. We too would like to be under the same roof. However, unless the peoples of the USSR succeed in conquering the centrifugal, national-egoistic tendencies, I fear that the best we can hope for is a row of separate shacks with destitute "sovereigns" sitting in front of them.

United States & Canada

U.S. Admiral's Statement on Gulf Weaponry Viewed

LD0102210491 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 1 Feb 91

[By TASS observer on military issues Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—Admiral William Crowe, former chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, made a supposition in Chicago recently that the impressive demonstration of the U.S. modern military technology in the Gulf, primarily of a high level of U.S. electronic systems and cruise missiles, can promote the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to reduce its Armed Forces or conclude new arms control agreements.

Crowe's statement about the Soviet Union's possible giving up of its principled disarmament stand under the influence of the impressive demonstration of the U.S. might can be regarded as his own idea. It is quite possible, however, that it reflected a negative attitude of some U.S. military circles to the very idea of arms control, and Admiral Crowe was engaging in wishful thinking. It is equally possible that the talk about the impressive demonstration of U.S. might is aimed at conditioning public opinion to a long-term U.S. military presence on the Arabian peninsula.

The United States was not spending hundreds of billions of dollars during more than four decades on getting prepared for a war against a country like Iraq. The difference between the two countries in their military potentials and the training of the personnel is obvious. The multinational forces on the Arabian peninsula inflicted a tremendous damage on the Iraqi military-industrial potential. Saddam Husayn's elite troops, the Republican Guard, sustained enormous losses as a result of attacking B-52 bombers. Those planes took off not only from the Diego Garcia base, but also for training from bases situated on the continental part of the United States.

Isolated information about the Desert Storm operation does not give a clear idea of the performance of electronic systems and cruise missiles, mentioned by Admiral Crowe. Censorship is unprecedentally tough on the Arabian peninsula, while official reports about the effectiveness of new weapon systems look very much like soap advertising clips shown by U.S. provincial television.

The Iraqis gave some unpleasant surprises to the U.S. Armed Forces during the war. The control and communication system,which was target no. 1 during U.S. bombing and missile attacks, turned out to be unexpectedly hardy and is still functioning. During the first several days of the conflict the multilateral forces managed to destroy only a small part of the enemy air force. Americans are engaged in an exhausting, not always successful search for mobile missile-launcing installations in the west and south of Iraq.

Previously Pentagon officials maintained that 50 out of 100 U.S. cruise missiles hit targets within the range of 30 metres. Journalists from the CNN television company reported, however, that one of the Cruise missiles, brought down in Baghdad, was heading directly towards their hotel al-Rashid. The explosion damaged their TV equipment.

At present, there seems to be no reasons for euphoria over the perfection of U.S. weapon systems. At the same time, there are no grounds for underestimating their combat efficiency.

U.S. Envoy Tours Possible Consular Sites

LD0502092891 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 5 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Vitrishchak]

[Text] Khabarovsk February 5 TASS—The United States plans to open a mission or a consulate in Khabarovsk, U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock told TASS today.

Matlock is now touring Siberia and the Soviet Far East.

"I am optimistic about the prospects for Soviet-American relations in the Pacific region," Matlock said.

More American businessmen and tourists are expected to visit Khabarovsk after the opening of a direct air route with Anchorage, Alaska, according to Matlock.

Bilateral contacts in various spheres will develop more actively, he said.

Ministry Denies Ceding Bering Territories to U.S.

PM0102164591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jan 91 First Edition p 5

[USSR Foreign Ministry reply to reader's letter under the rubric: "From Informed Sources": "The Truth About the 'Secret Treaty'"]

[Text] The other day USSR People's Deputy Colonel N.S. Petrushenko made a speech at our unit in which he said that he had in his possession the text of a treaty that had been kept from the public and which concerned the demarcation of territorial zones between the USSR and the United States in the Bering Sea and that this treaty stipulates that we are ceding 120 miles of our territory to the Americans. Can it really be true that we are trading our territory in exchange for U.S. concessions in other areas?
Major V. Vasilyev, Kubinka, Moscow Oblast

Answer from the USSR Foreign Ministry: The document referred to by USSR People's Deputy N.S. Petrushenko was the Agreement Between the Governments of the USSR and the United States on the Demarcation Line of

Sea Areas signed among other treaties on 1 June 1990 during USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States.

The need to conclude a document of this sort was felt long ago: after the sale of Alaska by Russia it was necessary to demarcate the fishing zones between the two states. At that time the so-called "1867 convention line" was drawn up, to which both sides adhered while nonetheless interpreting it in their own way on a number of occasions. This was not surprising, since only two coordinates along this line were clearly marked. In the 1970's, with the introduction of 200-mile economic zones, the need arose to demarcate not only fishing zones (defined, incidentally, by the USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 24 February 1977) but also the continental shelf, along with the need to resolve a number of other contentious questions.

In those instances where the 200-mile zones of the states overlap, the two sides, as is customary all over the world, reach an agreement about their demarcation lines—either agreeing on a median line (and USSR People's Deputy N.S. Petrushenko is a supporter of precisely this variant), or, when there are special circumstances, taking mutual interests into account. Both we and the United States have chosen the second variant. In this matter the Soviet position has been worked out taking into account suggestions not just from the Foreign Ministry, as some people think, but also from the ministries of defense, geology, fisheries, the gas industry (which existed at the time), and the USSR KGB.

Naturally, as when any other treaty is concluded, we have made concessions in some areas, and our partners have made concessions in others. Allegations that we have given away our territory to the United States are untrue because the sea areas in question never legally belonged to us. This was why the agreement was prepared, in order to remove contentious questions and resolve this problem in the proper way in line with international law.

As regards the statement that the agreement has been kept from the public, the text of the document was presented to all the organizations and persons concerned. It will be reviewed by the Cabinet of Ministers, after which it will be passed on for ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet. As a rule we do not publish treaties prior to their ratification.

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Welcomes DPRK-Japan Talks on Relations

PM0502103591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by Sergey Tikhomirov under the "Correspondent's Commentary" rubric: "Next Stop—Tokyo"]

[Text] Pyongyang—A Japanese delegation has been on a two-day visit to the DPRK, taking part in the first of a projected three rounds of talks aimed at establishing interstate relations between Japan and the DPRK.

Giving his "blessing" to the Pyongyang round of talks, in his speech to the Japanese DPRK Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam expressed the hope for the speediest success. When the sides had revealed their hands to one another (this essentially took the whole two days), however, it became clear that dialogue will not be easy.

The roots of the problems with which the sides are to concern themselves date back 45 years, to the time when Korea was a colony of militarist Japan. This is why the DPRK as first item on the agenda demanded an official apology from Tokyo for the misfortune and suffering inflicted on Korea during the years of annexation. Pyongyang links this issue—with which the Japanese side agrees in principle—with the problem of reparations, which will complicate the dialogue even at this stage.

All the signs suggest that the Japanese are prepared to examine the question of compensation in one form or another for their actions during the period of colonial rule in Korea. They will hardly agree to meet bills dated after 1945, however. Another serious hitch which the two sides clearly cannot avoid is the question of the DPRK's relations with the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Japanese delegation insists that the agency be permitted to see for itself at first hand that Pyongyang has no plans to create nuclear weapons. For its part, however, the DPRK claims that this problem should be discussed with the United States, since U.S. nuclear weapons are deployed in the south of the Korean peninsula.

South Korea is warning Japan against hasty steps along the road of normalizing relations with the DPRK, fearing, in particular, that material compensation from Tokyo may go to strengthen the North's military might. The United States, like some other countries of the region, makes no secret of similar fears.

Be that as it may, it is gratifying that representatives of the two countries have sat down at the negotiating table; the next round of talks is due to be held in Tokyo in March.

Talks Urged To Solve Korean Nuclear Issue

SK0502033891 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 3 Feb 91

[Commentary by station commentator (Girey Nihailov) from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] There was no concurrence for the nuclear safety issue to be discussed at the Pyongyang talks. According to Tokyo's allegations, the nuclear safety issue has been one of the factors that obstructs the normalization of relations between the DPRK and Japan. The basis of the

issue is as follow: Pyongyang signed the nuclear nonproliferation agreement in 1985. The DPRK does not, however, allow on-the-spot inspections of the nuclear facilities by the delegation of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Dealing with the issue carefully, some countries, including Japan, are suspicious of Korea that it may have initiated work of developing the nuclear weapons.

Saying that U.S. nuclear weapons have been deployed in the south of the peninsula, Pyongyang has been adhering to its position. This is also grounds for argument. It is natural that the existence of the unsettled issue should break up the mutual confidence on the peninsula. The proposal put forward by Pyongyang for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone is to solve the issue, which is being supported by many other countries, including the USSR, China, and countries that have nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union is willing to be cooperative in supporting the proposal for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. In view of a concerned party's position, establishing a nuclear-free zone is an important factor to reduce confrontation and tension on the Korean peninsula. It will also be a positive process on the Korean peninsula.

I would say this given the relationship between the ROK and the USSR, and between the ROK and China, which are actively proceeding, and given the talks between the DPRK and Japan for the normalization of the bilateral relations, and given dialogue between the North and the South.

There was no contact between Pyongyang and Washington. The nuclear safety issue on the Korean peninsula is a difficult problem to solve. The U.S. and North Korean delegations held talks in Beijing, but this is not enough. Pyongyang suggests that it will expand contacts with the United States.

At the upcoming talks between the DPRK and Japan, the Korean side is going to ask Japan to mediate the talks between Pyongyang and Washington in solving the nuclear safety issue. The improvement of dialogue between Washington and Pyongyang will play a key role in solving other problems. Unexpectedly, the issue of Team Spirit joint military exercise, which have beeen conducted by the United States and the ROK for many years, will be coordinated.

Although Washington and Seoul try to scale down the size of the military exercise, the DPRK continues to regard it as an infringement on their country's security. In short, solving the difficult problems on the Korean peninsula depends greatly on the United States' attitude. Because of this, it is very important for Washington and Pyongyang to initiate dialogue.

Blackout Exercise Reported in Pyongyang

SK0402150291 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 4 Feb 91

[From "Asian News" program]

[Text] Pyongyang again was immersed in blackness last night amid sounds of siren and loudspeakers.

A new blackout exercise was conducted for an hour in the downtown, simulating the situation of an air raid.

The alarm for the exercise in the DPRK's capital city was sounded for the fourth time this year, and the blackout exercise was held for the third time.

The exercise began in mid-January when the ROK declared the combat posture of its Armed Forces in connection with the war in the Persian Gulf. The ROK Government took such a step on the pretext that the danger of attack on the ROK by the DPRK would increase in the event that the U.S. troops in the ROK are dispatched to the Middle East.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for U.S.-Philippines Talks Viewed

HK0102092191 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Commentary by Vladimir Viktorov]

[Text] Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus has issued a statement on the bases issue, that the time element involved in the negotiations must be heeded. The present military bases agreement expires in September this year, therefore little time is left to tackle the issues which are important to both sides.

During the past 40 years, Subic Naval Base, Clark Air Base, and the other American installations in the Philippines have enjoyed uninterrupted operations. During that time, the Philippine Government has not been able to know exactly what goes on in the facilities—whether they are stockpiling nuclear weapons or other such weapons. American soldiers have not been subject to Philippine laws.

Meanwhile, movements against the bases have grown. Top government officials have also joined the oppositionist moves. Half of the Senate members support the military bases' dismantling.

Events show that this problem must be solved. During past negotiations between both sides, some differences have risen, mainly dealing with the financial question, or payment for the bases.

Reports indicate that Washington is pushing to keep the bases for 10-15 years, with rental payments to be in the form of military assistance. Manila wants the bases to stay only five to six years.

Once the facilities fall under the Philippine Government's control, Clark Air Base will be converted into an international airport, while Subic Naval Base will become a port. On the issue of the $500 million payment, Manila would like to receive the amount in full. Reports say this would be used to pay for the Philippines' foreign debt which now amounts to $28 billion.

It is no secret that the parlous state of the Philippine economy presents Washington with the opportunity to exert pressure on the Aquino government. Hence Manglapus' firm statement that the government stands by its initial decision should be heeded.

Does Manila have an alternative or new proposal on this issue? The talks next month between both sides will produce an answer to this question. Will this be the final round of talks between Manila and Washington?

Bomb Threat Reported at Manila Aeroflot Office

LD3001162491 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 30 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Bokhonko]

[Text] Manila January 30 TASS—All staff of the Aeroflot mission in Manila were urgently evacuated today after an unidentified person telephoned to say that a bomb was planted on the premises of the mission.

Police experts rushed to the scene but found no explosive device. They now believe that this was a hoax.

Earlier, similar telephone messages were received by other foreign missions, the Japanese Embassy in particular.

Even though no bombs have been found, local security bodies have not ruled out the possibility of actual terrorist acts against foreign missions, particularly after the abortive attempt by two Iraqi terrorists to blow up the American Cultural Centre office in Manila on January 19.

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov Interviewed Prior to Tehran Visit

LD0502100391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0914 GMT 5 Feb 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov left today for Tehran for consultations with the Iranian leadership on developments in the Persian Gulf situation.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent before his departure, the high-ranking Soviet diplomat noted that the USSR maintains close contact with the Iranian side, given that both countries "have a strong interest in seeing as quick an end as possible to the bloodshed in areas lying in direct proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union and Iran." The diplomat expressed the hope that the consultations will be frank and mutually useful.

Both in Moscow and in Tehran, he went on, thought is being given to what can be done to bring nearer a peaceful outcome of this conflict. "All peace initiatives, unfortunately, are currently being hampered by an uncompromising stand on the part of Baghdad, which is still refusing to fulfill the demand of the world community and move its troops out of Kuwait," Aleksandr Belonogov said. "That is why any peace initiative, no matter who it comes from, must certainly contain in it, as a necessary element, the question of the future of Kuwait." Without an answer to the question, of what is going to happen to Kuwait, it is difficult to proceed further along the path of a peaceful settlement, the diplomat pointed out.

According to Aleksandr Belonogov, the situation in the Persian Gulf region is developing quickly and it seems that the war is already "exceeding reasonable limits and is inflicting irremediable damage on Iraq". Recognition of the reality and steps toward the just and legal demand for the restoration of Kuwait's independence would be a demonstration of both courage and responsibility by the Iraqi leadership.

In conclusion, the USSR deputy foreign minister noted that the Soviet Union is constantly in contact with member countries of the UN Security Council, with Arab states, with Yugoslavia as the chair of the nonaligned Movement, with India, and with many others, since they all feel great concern about what is occurring in the Persian Gulf region.

Military Official Describes UN Peacekeeping Role

PM0102153791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 91 Union Edition p 6

[Interview with Lieutenant General V. Osipov, deputy chief of the General Staff Main Directorate, by V. Litovkin, place and date not given; under the "Informed Source" rubric: "Our Officers in UN Uniform"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] A group of USSR Armed Forces General Staff officers recently returned from a tour of the Near East where they visited Egypt, Israel, and Syria. The group acquainted itself with the work of the Soviet military observers who are helping the United Nations maintain a peaceful atmosphere in that region.

Lieutenant General V. Osipov, deputy chief of the General Staff Main Directorate, now tells our correspondent how our officers came to be with the United Nations and what they are doing there.

"Our officers have been serving with the UN Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO)," Vladimir Artashesovich said, "since October 1973.

UNTSO has existed since 1948. Its task is to monitor the situation in the region. Officers do not have the right to intervene in any conflict in any way or to seek to eliminate particular violations. Their main duty is to give the UN leadership rapid and objective information on events.

"To ensure that the picture is as objective as possible, officers from 19 countries are taking part in UNTSO. Apart from the USSR there are officers from the United States, China, Sweden, Chile, and New Zealand....

"We have 35 officers there. They range from captain to lieutenant colonel. Their average age is 35. They have higher education. The required qualifications are fluent English, work experience using all means of communication, and a driver's license.

"Their main work method is patroling the Sinai peninsula, which means uninhabited desert, stony roads, arid river beds, and abandoned caravan routes. As a rule the officers do not bear arms and work in small groups or autonomously, that is, on their own, alternating with a representative of another country. They drive up to 600 km a day on some routes and must be prepared for any surprise.

"They spend one week on duty, one week with their family at UNTSO's Cairo center, then one week on duty again. This is difficult service. Since 1948, 733 UN servicemen, including a Soviet, have died during peacekeeping operations.

"Our officers serve as UN observers not only in Egypt but also in Syria and Jordan. We hope that in the near future they will also serve on Israeli territory at UNTSO headquarters in Jerusalem."

[Litovkin] The fighting in the Persian Gulf region has clearly made their work more complex. How are they coping with it?

[Osipov] Undoubtedly things have not become easier for anyone in the region although, as you will understand, there is no link between the UN peacekeeping mission in Palestine and the efforts of the anti-Iraqi coalition to liberate Kuwait.

Everything in the Near East is so closely intertwined that if you tug at one thread you can tie everything up in knots. Iraq is currently launching one missile strike after another at Israeli territory. Yet as I have already said, UNTSO headquarters are located in Jerusalem and the lives of its staff are in direct danger. It is the same situation with Tiberias, where a subunit is located, and in Nahariyya and Gaza.

The main point I want to make is that at the moment Israel is showing restraint but it cannot be expected to last indefinitely. There may be a retaliatory strike and that will probably shatter the fragile truce between Israel and the Arab countries, which indeed is what Husayn is hoping for. Service in such conditions is extremely difficult for our officers and for the officers of the other UNTSO countries. All the UN staffers' families, including the officers' families, have been evacuated from Israel and that has made their life more complex. Of course, the moral and psychological tension at the observation posts and patrol routes has risen particularly sharply. A situation may arise in which neither terrorist acts nor the use of weapons of mass destruction can be ruled out.

[Litovkin] How do the UN chiefs rate the Soviet officers' work?

[Osipov] Briefly, they rate it highly.

On the whole the leadership of the UN military subunits is not accustomed to lavishing compliments. It is very restrained in its assessments. But I shall cite the view of H. Kristiansen, a major general in the Finnish Army and chief of UNTSO headquarters in Jerusalem. He said to me: "There is no doubt about the Soviet officers' professional qualities."

I can add my own impressions to that. The official reports on our officers that I have seen in my professional capacity contain three assessment grades: "above average," "average," and "below average." Some 60 percent are in the top grade and not one in the bottom grade.

[Litovkin] Are any of our officers serving with UN multinational military subunits elsewhere?

[Osipov] No, only in the Near East.

Iraqi Envoy Speaks on U.S. 'Imperialism' in Gulf

PM0402171091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Feb 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview With Ghafil Jasim Husayn, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Iraq to the USSR, by observer V. Afanasyev; place and date not given: "We Will Continue the Struggle"]

[Text] Many commentators believe the war in the Persian Gulf will have an enormous influence on the distribution of forces in the region, regardless of how it ends. In the meantime, material assets are being ruined, damage that may be irremediable is being inflicted on the ecology, and, worst of all, human blood is being shed.

Our observer V. Afanasyev asked Mr. Ghafil Jasim Husayn, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Iraq to the USSR, to answer some questions.

[Afanasyev] On 17 January, the countries of the anti-Iraq coalition commenced military operations against Iraq. Could you comment on this, Mr. Ambassador?

[Husayn] The aggression perpetrated by imperialist and Zionist forces headed by the United States is barbarous and perfidious, far removed from elementary humanitarian and moral principles. It was directed against the

Iraqi people and their economic, cultural, and scientific facilities. Bomb and missile strikes are taking place against settlements, schools, hospitals, kindergartens, nonmilitary plants, as well as mosques and other religious buildings. Strikes are being conducted against peaceful cities, villages, and communications routes, far distant from military targets. This was done for the sake of imperialist dominance over the peoples, with a view to destroying their striving for progress.

The people of Iraq will continue the struggle, headed by the patriotic leadership, which has not yielded to imperialism and neocolonialism and defends the people's legitimate rights, sovereignty, and dignity. The broad Arab masses, Muslims, and all people of goodwill on earth are on our people's side. Our people will without fail strike a crushing blow against the conspiracy and its agents and will make them realize that the Arab nation, divided by the West, is a united nation with the right to live according to its will, without imperialist diktat.

If those who talk about defending the international rule of law were really seeking that, they would not be inflicting such savage blows on Iraq's civilian population. They should have defended the flouted rights of the Palestinian people, in order to make Israel capitulate. But they do not seek that.

[Afanasyev] How do you think events will develop next, Mr. Ambassador?

[Husayn] Unless American imperialism and its accomplices stop their aggression against Iraq and withdraw their troops outside the bounds of Arab territories and the Muslim holy places, the conflict will continue to develop, it will take in other countries and regions, and then the camp of good, against the camp of imperialism and neocolonialism, will grow wider. Imperialism will inevitably suffer defeat, because history confirms that victory always goes to the peoples, however awesome the camp of injustice and oppression may be and however mighty its weaponry.

[Afanasyev] This war is bringing incalculable troubles both to the Iraqi people and to other peoples of the region. Do you not think, Mr. Ambassador, that it is necessary urgently to return to tackling this acute problem by peaceful means? What, in your opinion, could be the conditions for achieving peace and for such talks to succeed?

[Husayn] First of all I must point out that the United States has done everything possible to prevent any Arab solution to the problem in the region, using diktat and threats to that end. The Security Council resolutions against Iraq are purely an American solution, which we consider unjust and unlawful. Iraq wants a universal and just peace based on the international rule of law. Iraq is not opposed to a new world order based on the international rule of law, an order on the basis of which all the region's problems, and particularly the Palestinian question, would be resolved justly.

But the Americans want to resolve these questions single-handedly by means that suit them, so as to secure only their own interests and those of their allies. We believe that the best option for resolving the question is to end the aggression, withdraw imperialist forces from Arab territories and the Muslim holy places, and give the Arabs the opportunity to resolve their own problems. In that way the implementation of the international rule of law could be achieved, as was pointed out in President Saddam Husayn's initiative of 12 August 1990, which makes provision for the resolution of all the region's problems by stages and on a just basis. This applies first and foremost to the problem of the oppressed Arab people of Palestine.

[Afanasyev] What role, in your opinion, could the Soviet Union play at this stage in ending the hostilities and achieving success at peace talks?

[Husayn] We have been accustomed to seeing the Soviet Union always taking the side of the peoples' just cause and their struggle against colonial oppression and imperialist and Zionist diktat. If the situation in the international arena has changed in favor of ending the cold war, lessening international tension, and progressing along the path of the new thinking, that certainly does not mean that it is necessary to fling open the door to American imperialism and give it the opportunity single-handedly to decide the peoples' fate. Therefore the Soviet Union should play a positive role here and not permit the devastation of a friendly country and the annihilation of its people, including women, old people, and children; it should support the real international rule of law on the basis of the UN Charter and common human principles.

Syrian Information Minister Explains Gulf Stance

LD0402192891 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Statement by Syrian Information Minister Muhammad Salman; place and date not given]

[Text] [Announcer] Our correspondent in Damascus, Igor Rostov, has met with Syrian Information Minister Muhammad Salman, and asked him to speak about Damascus's position on the Gulf dispute. Here is what he said in his interview:

[Begin Salman recording] The Syrian position was declared in the first moments [of the conflict]. In its declaration, Syria expressed the view that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was a serious matter, which could lead to consequences not only for Iraq but also for all of the region. We had expected a large-scale military explosion that could destroy the capabilities of that country, its people, its economy, and its Army. We also saw that it would be difficult for the international community to accept the undermining of a state by a neighboring state. For this reason, from the first moments, we sought an Arab solution to this problem through the convening of an Arab summit meeting.

But we could not achieve a decision that would bind the Iraqi president to withdraw from Kuwait. With all regret, the UN Security Council resolutions came later. We pledged our commitment to these resolutions because our asessment was that these resolutions were correct, and that the Iraqi president must abide by these resolutions and withdraw so as to spare the region great dangers that might lead, in turn, to effects on this nation, and not Iraq alone.

For this reason, we subsequently supported all sincere initiatives that called on the Iraqi president to withdraw from Kuwait. Regrettably, he did not respond; either to the calls and resolutions of the Arab summit—as he refused to carry out these resolutions—or to the resolutions of the United Nations.

On an individual level, President Hafiz al-Asad took an initiative on 12 January, sending a message to the Iraqi president urging him [to withdraw], and pledged that if he would withdraw from Kuwait, Syria would stand by the side of the Iraqi people and the Iraqi Army, and it would stand by his side and with him, to fight anyone who would want to fight Iraq or commit aggression against Iraq, even under the pretext or the excuse that Iraq had occupied Kuwait.

But, regrettably, the Iraqi president's answer to the message of President Hafiz al-Asad was negative, from which we only perceived his determination to continue the invasion of Kuwait, and consequently, to stay on without consideration of the international community, individual efforts, or President Hafiz al-Asad's call. He took no heed, as if he was living on his own in this world, and disregarded international resolutions and consensus.

As a matter of fact, what concerns Syria most these days are the dangers that might result from the military action in this region, and we still hope that the Iraqi president will withdraw from Kuwait and work with the Arabs to secure inter-Arab solidarity by means of which we can respond to all those who turn covetous eyes on this region. In particular, we are always expecting Israel to take advantage of these circumstances, and this always leads to its expansionism in occupying new Arab lands.

For sure, if it had not been for the Iraqi president's invasion of Kuwait, the Arab nation, with the efforts it was making to put an end to disputes between some of its member states, would have been able to secure inter-Arab solidarity that would have led to an Arab decision to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict through the new approach that we perceive, a serious approach, too, on the part of the international community to put an end to the problems of the Middle East, and the other problems. This was also what we heard from Comrade Gorbachev. [end recording]

Defense Official Denies Supplying Arms to Iraq

AU0402190591 Berlin DER MORGEN in German 1 Feb 91 p 1

[ADN report: "USSR: No Nuclear Arms to Iraq"]

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The Soviet Union has denied reports that it supplied nuclear weapons to Iraq. As the press spokesman of the Defense Ministry stated in answer to an ADN inquiry about a report in the Algerian newspaper EL MUJAHID, "as a signatory to the Non-proliferation Treaty and true to its principles," the USSR "never provided anybody with nuclear weapons."

Major General Bogdanov, chief of the Center for Operational Strategic Analyses of the USSR General Staff, yesterday warned against an underestimation of the Iraqi military potential. Baghdad has an arsenal of means capable of "inflicting heavy losses upon an opponent." Although there is currently no immediate threat to the USSR, the Soviet General Staff is watching the development of the situation in the Gulf very attentively, in order to be able to adequately react to changes, Bogdanov stressed. After two weeks it has become clear that the war will drag on. There will not be an easy victory for the multinational forces. Iraq still has missiles and chemical and bacteriological weapons, he said. It is too early to predict an absolute Iraqi defeat at this point. In the general's opinion, talking about a superiority of the U.S. weapons over the Scud missile that the Soviet Union supplied to Iraq is unjustified. The Scud was developed more than 30 years ago, whereas the multinational forces use missiles that are being tested for the first time in the Gulf in a kind of testing area, he said. At the same time, the general warned against the extension of the Gulf war and the complete destruction of the Iraqi military and industrial potential. "As is generally known, the United Nations did not give such a mandate to the multinational forces."

Western specialists proceeded on the assumption that the U.S. Supreme Command has plans for low-capacity nuclear strikes if Iraq uses chemical weapons. The U.S. troops in the Gulf have approximately 1,000 nuclear warheads. In this case the situation might get out of control.

International Relations Committee Discusses War

LD0502010191 Moscow TASS in English 2117 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet committee on International Affairs discussed the Gulf war at today's meeting.

The threat of the war's escalation in the region, fraught with unpredictable and possibly irreparable consequences, provokes serious concern among Soviet legislators.

In their opinion, combat operations are even now exceeding the mandate given by the U.N. Security council. Missiles and bombs are destroying whole residential areas, killing people.

The sides conceal the real number of casualties among civilian population.

The anxiety of lawmakers over a gloomy, although very hypothetical, prospect for the use of mass destructive weapons not far from Soviet borders is quite understandable.

On the other hand, damage from the use of ecological weapons—fires at oilfields and the oil slick in the Gulf—is quite tangible.

Summing up the discussion, Committee chairman Aleksandr Dzasokhov pointed to the need to give every assistance, including that under the U.N. auspices, to attempts to find a political solution to the conflict and to cease fire in the Gulf in the interests of implementing the Security Council decisions.

International legislative quarters are called upon the international community to prevent from rolling back from the present positions to the cold war, Dzasokhov said.

The committee decided to recommend that the Soviet Government set up an expert group to control the situation in the Gulf.

The committee also called on the international community to outlaw ecological weapons.

In compliance with a decision made by the Soviet legislature, the committee chose deputies to a special legislative group to monitor developments in the Gulf.

The meeting also examined the response abroad to developments in the Soviet Baltic republics.

Legislators approved newly appointed Soviet ambassadors to foreign countries, who were nominated by the Foreign Ministry. While discussing this issue, lawmakers gave some recommendations to the ambassadors.

Soviet Officials Hold Talks on Persian Gulf War

Yazov Meets With Syrian Minister

LD0402143891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1357 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Feb (TASS)—General Mustafa Talas, minister of defense of the Syrian Arab Republic, who arrived in the Soviet Union today for an official visit, has had a meeting with Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

General Mustafa Talas and Marshal Dmitriy Yazov discussed the situation in the Near East caused by the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf region, and also the state of and prospects for the development of bilateral Soviet-Syrian relations in the military sphere. Present at the discussion were on the Soviet side Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed forces, and on the Syrian side Muhammad 'Isam al-Na'ib, ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Soviet Union.

The same day the Syrian guest visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall, and laid flowers.

Dzasokhov Receives Mideast Envoys

LD0202034191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1911 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Feb (TASS)—An exchange of opinions on a wide range of problems linked to the situation in the Persian Gulf region took place during today's meeting of Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs; Mohamed Hadj Yala, ambassador of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria in the USSR; and Slaheddine Abdallah, ambassador of Tunisia in the USSR.

The heads of the diplomatic missions gave high appraisal to the consistent course of the Soviet leadership for preventing armed confrontation in the Persian Gulf region, and after the start of military actions—for the speediest end to the war and restoration of peace in this region. They stressed that continuous military actions and their increasing scale are exceeding the aims stated in the UN resolutions, and that they result in multiple casualties, grave economic losses, and destruction of the the region's ecology.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov informed the ambassadors on the steps taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its presidium to localize the crisis and put an end to the war, and on daily contacts of the USSR president and the Soviet leadership aimed at finding ways for a transfer of the accumulated problems into the political settlement channel.

Various Reactions to War in Gulf Reported

Soviet Attitudes Explored

PM0402153291 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 91 p 3

["Viewpoint" by correspondent N. Dolgopolov: "And Husayn, Friend of the Desert..."]

[Excerpts] Paris—This war smells more of oil than of blood. Saddam's inflexible persistence has come up against Bush's stubbornness. As a result, the world finds itself with a war that threatens to develop into a general catastrophe. What about us, who considered ourselves the second superpower? We are silent, still silent. [passage omitted]

Today the military wise guys and political strategists are asserting: Husayn cannot win this war. For heaven's sake, surely it is clear that morally Husayn has already won it? Which of the Arabs' holy leaders has stood firm for longer in battles against the accursed enemy—the imperialists and Zionists? Certainly, An-Nasir was

defeated by Israel in less than a week. But Saddam has hung on for at least two, and is even lashing out, inflicting losses, and has managed to poison the sea with oil. This is in a battle against none other than the strongest military power, reinforced by the might of 27 allies. One Arab state against a huge worldwide machine! In the eyes of ordinary Arabs, not Arab politicians, Saddam is the moral victor. If Allah now sends him down a particle of common sense, so as to declare a truce and emerge from the war, Husayn will promptly be declared the greatest leader of the Arab world. Who punished the imperialists and Zionists? Who beat them on land and in the skies? Saddam. Who strove to help the unfortunate people of Palestine, forgotten and rejected by everyone? He did. Perhaps he will even be forgiven the occupation of Kuwait: Think about it, he trampled the pro-American shaykhs.

Note one detail that has not been overpublicized. Even a few days before Bush gave the command "Fire!" peace could still have been saved in the region. The French president proposed to the United Nations a subtle and tempting initiative. But the Security Council did not discuss it in substance, but rejected it, and preferred to stick to its own ultimatum and pin futile hopes on its secretary general's visit to Baghdad. Our loud, freedom-loving Soviet voice, contrary to expectations, also was not heard emanating from New York.

True, talks with Saddam were conducted by someone who, as it turned out, was an old friend of his—Academician Primakov. But even old connections did not work at all. Even the Soviet hostages—let us call things by their proper names—were only released from Iraq at the very end of the line, when all the Westerners were already back home, sitting over a cup of tea and talking about the hell they had been through.

Did the USSR put forward any real diplomatic initiative? After all, it was obvious that our idea of convening a conference on the Near East, an idea that is correct in principle but unfortunately rather hoary, would be rejected. There were hints in the Western press of contacts between the Soviet president and Saddam, but what were these contacts, what form did they take?

Are we really so stubborn? Hit till the blood flows, drink till you drop, vote and support someone just as unreservedly. In the second half of the eighties our country's ossified diplomacy suddely disgorged a new wave. It was a lucky outburst. People looked at us with surprise: As well they might, because at the end of its seventh decade the colossus had voluntarily renounced its obsolete dogmas. But this unexpected wave, after sweeping across the planet, died away just as suddenly. What is to succeed it? Surely not the old fixed ways, only in the shape of new dogmas? It seems we have avoided the characteristic errors of the past, but have not yet created anything positive in world politics. Today, at this crucial time, against the sound of breaking waves and the thunder of bombs and weapons dominating the Gulf, we are neither seen nor heard. Never mind about the Persian Gulf, we have to escape from our own Baltic avalanche. Nothing could be more wrong than this widespread opinion. Of course, domestic policy restricts the freedom of maneuvering in foreign policy. But even apart from our Soviet will, it so happens that we are the only people, other than the Principality of Liechtenstein, who are capable of putting out the burning match. We are not directly involved in the conflict. While condemning Saddam, nonetheless we have prodently refrained from quarreling with him. Despite Vilnius and Riga, the understanding that was beginning to be established with the States has not collapsed completely. The world is waiting for a word, a step, a move from us. We have been granted a fantastic opportunity to appear as true saviors. The president himself, whose international prestige, in spite of everything, is higher than his domestic prestige, could display political perspicacity to all the continents.

Thank heavens, our arms are not being twisted too much in big politics. The gossip says that the USSR is remaining silent in exchange for promised American aid. People do not realize that if the war drags on for months, as Bush now fears, there will be no way they can help us. Iraq was not Grenada, and America is disappointed; people could not even watch the Superbowl American football final in peace. Saddam Husayn, Allah be with him, should apparently have been more complaisant. The world has a chance, and so do we. Because war is always impotence, inability to find a solution. A solution can still be found today. As for tomorrow—I have grave doubts.

Coalition's Aims Questioned

PM0502093191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Jan 91 p 5

[Article by E. Volodin under the "World Events" rubric: "Iraqi Tragedy—An Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] The second week of the pro-American coalition's war against the Iraqi people is drawing to a close. A war, I repeat, not against Saddam Husayn's regime or for the sake of Kuwait's liberation, but against the people of Iraq. Because when cities and villages are bombed and when military targets in Baghdad come under fire, no matter what the military experts say, peaceful people meet their deaths. The women, old people, and children who have died in their tens of thousands constitute the first and most graphic results of the coalition's "liberation mission" carried out with the UN Security Council's blessing.

I am no military specialist, and I am in no position to comment on the military aspect of operations carried out by the U.S. Army and its "comrades-in-arms." But anyone can see that if the entire Iraqi territory is being bombarded and aircraft are leaving Turkish airfields to deliver strikes not against troops deploy a thousand kilometers from the Turkish border but significantly closer, then it is clear that the liberation of Kuwait is

nothing but a cover for the strategic aim of destroying Iraq's military and economic potential so that, in the event of victory for the "liberation forces," the political system can subsequently be altered. It is this that leaves me in no doubt that the righteous indignation which followed the invasion of Kuwait was essentially hypocritical—Kuwait has become merely a pretext for a large-scale war to establish a new political disposition in the Near and Middle East which is bound to suit the United States and Israel.

The pro-American and pro-Israeli world propaganda machine has done everything possible to stigmatize the seizure of Kuwait. Its efforts have been aimed right at demonstrating that something extraordinary has occurred in the world has and that justice flouted must be immediately restored. While readily conceding that Kuwait was seized by force of arms, I nevertheless wonder where the world community and world public opinion were when Grenada and Panama were invaded or when Lebanese, Syrian, Jordanian, and Egyptian territory was overrun. Why did the United Nations neither declare a blockade against the aggressors nor deprive the invaders of milk and medicines?

It could be argued that it would be impossible to blockade the United States. True, it would be impossible. But it certainly was possible to apply the same moral judgments which have now become all but incantations. The failure to do this illustrated that same double standard which passes one sentence on the strong and a quite different one on the weak. That is why every bomb now falling on Iraq's peaceful population explodes the propaganda myth about the justice of the war against Iraq. Every bomb confirms that what is going on in the Persian Gulf region is the most blatant slaughter, that what is being implemented is the very real genocide of the Iraqi people.

There is no doubt about the need to liberate Kuwait. But the vast numbers of troops pulled in from all around the world and the unimaginable quantity of military hardware capable of destroying every living thing in that small Arab country many times over point to something more significant than the liberation of one Persian Gulf country. Indeed, everything that has happened since 2 August 1990 has shown that, concurrently with the transfer of American troops and the involvement of Armed Forces from the "liberation coalition," there was an increase in ultimatum-type demands to Iraq and the "peace-loving diplomacy" turned into the usual U.S. gunboat diplomacy, leaving no room for dialogue and dictating surrender terms to the enemy.

Was it really not clear that such a tone and such methods could act as "arguments" only because it was known in advance that there would be no dialogue? I venture to assert that after 2 August, that is after the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi troops, nobody looked for political ways out of the crisis and that all the politicking, including the "goodwill pause," was aimed at augmenting the military grouping against Iraq. If this is so, then the massed raids on cities must have been planned in advance by the "coalition command," which also must have made advance provision for blowing up oil storage tanks and oilfields in Kuwait and southern Iraq. The ecological catastrophe was a miscalculation [proschityvalas] and was deliberately dismissed as one of the consequences of military actions in Iraq. In the same vein even Kuwait was regarded by the "liberators" as merely a theater of military actions for future operations actually on Iraqi territory.

In short, Kuwait was knowingly sacrificed to the geopolitical tasks of destroying the country, the people, and the regime in Iraq. So who is more cynical in their declarations and actions—Saddam Husayn, appealing to history and ignoring diplomatic relations with Kuwait, or the "liberation coalition," concealing U.S. strategic aims and interests behind the defense of the sovereignty of Kuwait, which will be transformed after the war into a desert of blazing oil?

In the space of six months everything possible has been done to transform Saddam Husayn into the devil incarnate and to present the Iraqi regime as the worst embodiment of totalitarianism. It would seem that before 2 August 1990 it was an ordinary regime, whereas after 2 August everybody's eyes were opened and they could see the true face of the dictator. I do not know what is more in evidence here—hypocrisy, political feeblemindedness, or blatant falsehood relying on people's gullibility. Most likely all three come together to justify the "liberation coalition's" aggression against Iraq in this way.

There is not enough newspaper space to enumerate all the totalitarian, autocratic, racist, and imperial regimes in existence today. Let alone to discuss all the individuals and "leaders." The singling out of Saddam Husayn is merely a propaganda action to secure world public acceptance of the real aim of the war in the Persian Gulf region—to set up not simply a new but a fundamentally pro-American regime in Iraq.

Incidentally, our blustering radical-democratic press is placing particular emphasis on the Iraqi president's personality and is particularly alarmed by totalitarianism. It argues with less passion, more in sorrow, for the denunciation of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation with Iraq. This sorrowful tone is itself indicative of the level of morality of those who in the name of freedom, equality, and fraternity heap curses on the president of a **friendly** (according to the Treaty) country and take delight in the 20,000 sorties by the "liberation" air forces raining down their deadly payloads on the peaceful inhabitants of an ancient land.

So what is at stake? Still the aim of changing the political system in Iraq. Given a pro-American regime created via the destruction of Iraq by the U.S. "liberation coalition" and through our equivocal "nonintervention," the Treaty will provide a political basis for cooperation with a future "progressive and democratic" government (although nobody has yet been able to prove that this

government will be progressive and democratic. Nobody has ventured to put a price on this "progress and democracy." After all, the price is the blood of the Iraqi people, their children, and their future).

We are constantly assured of the necessity of combating the totalitarian regime in Iraq. It would be extremely rash to view the war now being waged against the Iraqi people only as a war against Saddam Husayn's "totalitarian regime." In the event of victory for the "liberation coalition" a totally new situation will emerge in the Near East, the Arab world, and the entire world community. This has to be discussed right now, irrespective of the course and outcome of the hostilities. Future plans and actions must also be thoroughly evaluated, the more so since they are already being talked about. In an interview with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA (24 January, page three), the young RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev said something that a more experienced diplomat would hardly have dared state. I quote:

"We have to start thinking now about peace initiatives once the war is over.

"For instance, we can set the whole world an example by changing the military-export policy and appeal once again for joint measures involving all Near East states and all countries exporting weapons there. Much can be done to tighten measures on the nonproliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons.

"The time has finally come to raise, tactfully but persistently, the question of democratization, glasnost, and the observance of human rights in the Near East region—after all, in conditions of democracy the emergence of new Saddam Husayns will be rendered impossible". (my emphasis—E.V.).

Those words are nice: "Tactfully but persistently"! Translated into ordinary, traditional terminology they mean an imperial policy linked not only with the forcible annexation of others' lands but also with the installation of regimes and governments which are advantageous to certain people. It does not matter that this imperialism will be decked in democratic robes. What matters is that the world stands on the threshold of a reconstruction carried out in accordance not with the will of the peoples themselves but with the orders of zealots preaching democracy and glasnost. What they represent will be decided neither in Moscow nor in the RSFSR Foreign Ministry. The initial Iraq experience shows that the decisions will be made in the United States; and it is this ultimate aim of the Iraq war which each one of us, the entire Arab world, the members of the "liberation coalition," and the whole world community must recognize.

'No End to Madness' Seen

LD0402181891 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Station "analysis"]

[Text] In 19 days of fighting, more than 41,000 sorties have been made to strike at Iraq's military targets with missiles and bombs. There is a huge oil slick in the Gulf, and there have been early trial battles on land. The number of civilian casualties has been growing. What next? Now the view of our commentator Yuriy Solton.

There is no end to madness in sight. On Sunday the United States Defense Secretary Richard Cheney admitted that Iraq has retained the ground troops as the nucleus of its Armed Forces. THE LOS ANGELES TIMES discloses with reference to official sources that ground fighting will get underway in 10 to 20 days. Israel declares it can hardly to wait [as heard] to deliver a retaliatory blow at Iraq. For its part, Baghdad has repeated its appeal to the Muslims everywhere to amount a jihad, a crusade against the United States and its allies, and harass them all over the world. In the British Foreign Secretary Sir [as heard] Douglas Hurd's view, Iraq will almost certainly use chemical agents.

It was obviously proper for Pope John Paul II to say on Sunday that the continuation of the Gulf war meant a growing threat to all humanity. Although diplomacy failed to prevent war, it must prove its effect today to prevent the pursuit of a fair cause, the liberation of Kuwait from Iraq's occupation, from turning into a global tragedy. Even the loftiest of goals justifies far from all means. It seems that actions by the coalition Armed Forces, if not checked, can go beyond the framework of the United Nations Security Council resolutions, allowing the use of necessary means, not necessarily force, to liberate Kuwait. We share the view of those politicians who favour a suspension of the war and fresh searches for a political settlement.

Before the war the United Nations Security Council passed one resolution after another about the situation in the Gulf. Now, when the war can easily grow into a threat to world peace, the Council is silent. Proposals to convene a special session have been blocked by the United States and Britian, which, as is evident, have decided to go to the end and not only to liberate Kuwait but to destroy Iraq.

The Soviet Union, which, if you recall, voted for the United Nations Security Council's last resolution, has been increasingly concerned over events in the Persian Gulf. This anxiety was voiced at the combined fullscale meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Soviet Communist Party last week. The meeting urged this country's leadership to adopt necessary additional steps to stop the bloodshed and turn the military conflict into the channel of a political decision in the spirit of the United Nations Security Council's resolutions. I think the country's leadership will take this view into consideration. It is hard to say beforehand, but new Soviet initiatives are not ruled out.

Reports Mark India's Independence Anniversary

Indian Envoy Interviewed

91UF0393A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jan 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report on an interview with Prem Budkhwar, Indian charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, and A.A. Kuznetsov, head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Indian Studies Center, by Mariam Salganik; place and date not given: "Birthday Thoughts": "Are We Doing Everything for the Development of Relations With India?"]

[Text] January 26. The day when India proclaimed itself a republic, the birthday of our great—in the direct and figurative sense—neighbor. We are united with India by long-standing, firm ties of friendliness and good-neighborliness.

Not so long ago a current joke among Soviet journalists was: About India—say something good or nothing at all. Then came the era of glasnost, our horizons widened and our opportunities expanded—and there came crashing down on us such an avalanche of problems that, consumed by them, we failed to pay all that much attention to India.

Who does not know that feelings, however, even the warmest and most sincere, suffer from neglect....

It was with roughly these thoughts that I went to interview Prem Budhwar, Indian charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

"What do you mean," he said, "relations between India and the USSR at the highest level have traditionally been cordial and frank. This is natural—our states are united by common interests and a similarity of views on all the most important problems of the modern world. If we are speaking about the so-called working level, here also I would give our relations a satisfactory mark."

[Salganik] Much is being written in the Indian newspapers about the difficulties that have arisen on account of the fact that Intourist canceled the trips to India of almost 150 tour groups without warning.

[Budhwar] The number of Soviet tourists is not that great but they would visit us regularly, and a whole infrastructure has been created in India intended precisely for them—with regard for their limited financial possibilities. The cancellation of the trips, which occurred unexpectedly, right at the start of 1991, which we had declared tourism year, has caused the Indian side losses, of course. What is particularly unpleasant about this business is the fact that it has put many business people on their guard and forced them into drawing far-reaching conclusions.

[Salganik] Do you know the reason for the surprise cancellation?

[Budhwar] I believe that here, as in many other instances also, the reason is your approach to the rupee. About two months ago I read an article by IZVESTIYA's Delhi correspondent, in which he very cogently showed the need for its revision. Given your present need for consumer goods, in which India is particularly rich, you could purchase much here for rupees. But Soviet organizations simply refuse rupees. Where is the logic? It is more convenient for us also to obtain commodities from you for rupees. Your experts say that the rupee is an exclusive, nonconvertible currency. But it is a stable currency with good purchasing power!

[Salganik] The stereotypical notion of India as a "third world" country whose currency cannot be worth anything continues to operate, evidently. But India is in eighth place in the world in terms of industrial production, in third place in terms of numbers of research personnel!

[Budhwar] The very term "third world" is unfortunate, in my view, not to mention the fact that it summarily relegates to the background two-thirds of mankind. What countries rank themselves as "second world," incidentally? I have not come across a list of these for some reason.

[Salganik] In any event, the term "third world" lost its right to exist with the curtailment of the bloc confrontation which had engendered it.

[Budhwar] I totally agree. There is now frequent criticism in your country of the practice of granting credit to developing countries—yet another insufficiently precise term. Yes, the Soviet Union has unpleasant experience of the extension of credit to certain countries; but in questioning this practice as a whole it is necessary to rely on the facts. You are currently benefiting from the long-standing extension of credit to India, as formerly we also benefited and continue to benefit. We are repaying our debts to you honestly—with interest. India always abides by its obligations—this is not only our policy, it is our philosophy of life. India has used Soviet credit prudently, it has helped us, and I would like to emphasize that we will remember this, we Indians do not forget kindness. Today the credit payments are supporting to a considerable extent your purchases in India. We are today granting you industrial credit, not very much, but as much as we can....

[Salganik] Does India render the Soviet Union humanitarian assistance also?

[Budhwar] Of course. When the disaster in Armenia occurred, India sent half a dozen aircraft with medicines and food, and our ambassador handed the Armenian government a check for 4.7 million rupees. In response to an appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning assistance to the victims of Chernobyl, India last year sent a check for 10 million rupees. Now, in connection with your food difficulties, we have offered you one million tons of grain on credit and 40,000 tons of rice free. This is, clearly, a drop in the ocean, but we are

doing what we can. You also have always come to our assistance at difficult times. That you will cope with the present difficulties we have no doubt, but we are prepared to help you over the longer term also. For example, you are turning to world management experience. It is for you yourselves, of course, to choose where to invite experts from, but India stands next to you, and, what is of considerable importance, in my opinion, our country regards you sympathetically and is really interested in the prosperity of the Soviet Union. We are disturbed when things do not go well for you. We have suggested repeatedly that you avail yourselves of our experience.

[Salganik] This could most likely be done within the framework even of the interstate agreement on scientific and cultural exchange, which has also been in effect for many years?

[Budhwar] As you wish. Unfortunately, this agreement—and it affords extensive opportunities for exchanges in many spheres—is not currently being fulfilled in the best way. Threads which should be preserved for the future are being cut on account of budget considerations. For example, I have been told that Soviet publishers are suspending work on the joint project "India and the Soviet Union: Literature of the 20th Century"—20 volumes each of the best literary works of each country, half of which have already been published.

[Salganik] What does the other side think about this? How do those who are in fact engaged in them evaluate the present state of Soviet-Indian relations? Wishing to hear the other side, I met with A.A. Kuznetsov, head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Indian Studies Center and the author of serious works on India. He said:

[Kuznetsov] I would like to begin with the fact that it was not fortuitous that the first international document of the new political thinking and the first step in the direction of the de-ideologization of Soviet foreign policy was the Delhi Declaration—the particular nature of the relations of the Soviet Union and India was auspicious for this.

[Salganik] How has India perceived the change in the direction of de-ideologization?

[Kuznetsov] Ambivalently. With a certain guardedness initially even. There is nothing surprising about this—India also had become accustomed to living in a bipolar world, in the magnetic field between the two superpowers, and deriving certain benefits from their confrontation. If we are speaking of Soviet-Indian economic affairs, here also India, like we too, had become accustomed to guaranteed purchases: It did not have to worry all that much about how much was sold, how much purchased, and about quality. Such trade does not stimulate development.

[Salganik] A number of our economists would take issue with you here, saying that India is interested primarily in our energy supplies, in precisely what brings in hard currency for the Soviet Union.

[Kuznetsov] Which we would then spend on acquiring those same consumer goods which in India would cost us less. But directly connected with the problem of the rupee is another most serious problem: the need for a change in the structure of our trade with India. Much water has passed under the bridge in 40 years, and India has not remained as it was, nor is the Soviet Union the same, but we are still attempting to move by an inertial force whose reserves are already spent. India is a country with a mixed, extraordinarily diversified economy and with a developed sector of small and medium-sized business, which caters for up to 60 percent of production. This sector is prepared to purchase in our country far from just energy, and it could be suited by our technology also, but given payment in rupees. There is a host of possibilities here, but we may avail ourselves of them only by the methods of real market economy.

[Salganik] Are there, from your viewpoint, opportunities for an updating of Soviet-Indian relations in the sphere of science and culture? They are for the time being, it would seem, the first casualties of the transition to a market economy.

[Kuznetsov] Most disturbing symptoms are being displayed here. To start with the fact that ideological predetermination was reflected most strongly in this sphere. Let us take book exchange, for example. Books were written for India which had in practice to be to the liking of our own ideological services and they were published in India on our subsidies, distributed by organizations ideologically close to us, and read by no one. What was there to read in them? Our publishers putting out valuable literature did not have the right to distribute their product independently—with regard for the requirements of the Indian market. Everything went through "Mezhdunarodnaya kniga," which was not concerned with profits but with fulfilling the corresponding instructions, which has truly made Soviet publications unprofitable. They can be made profitable, but this will require work, and our biggest publishing houses—"Progress" and "Raduga"—driven into a corner of confusion, have simply stopped publishing literature in languages of India—"small" Indian languages, which in the context of India means languages spoken by up to 50 million persons a time. Radio broadcasts in Indian languages are being closed down for the sake of economies—just at a time when an opportunity has finally emerged with us for the normal illustration of what is happening in our country.

I have seen the results of a poll conducted by Indian sociologists in Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras: 80 percent of those polled declared their interest in the changes in the USSR. Further, a real India boom is taking place in our country, but the demand is being met by cooperative publishers, while the state publishers are reducing the number of Indian translations into Russian.

[Salganik] What is most preventing the development of scientific exchange?

[Kuznetsov] Even more than the shortage of resources, a lack of initiative in the search for new forms of exchange which should replace the archaic organizational structures. The future will not forgive us if we fail to deal intelligently with the immense capital which has been earned in our relations with India.

Gorbachev Sends Greetings

PM2901104391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 91 Second Edition p 1

[Message from M. Gorbachev congratulating Indian leaders on 41st anniversary of Republic of India—date not given]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr. R. Venkataraman, president of the Republic of India

To His Excellency Mr. Chandra Shekhar, prime minister of the Republic of India

On the 41st anniversary of India's proclamation as a republic I send you and the entire friendly Indian people congratulations and good wishes.

Your country has enriched the international community with unique experience of resolving complex problems in line with the principles of democracy and progress. Great India is making its indispensable contribution to building a new, peaceful order.

Today, when the prospect which has opened up on this plane at the end of the "cold war" has been subjected to a grave ordeal, mutual understanding and cooperation are particularly important among all who are devoted to the principles of the indivisibility of the values of the civilized world. The Delhi Declaration retains all its international significance.

The Soviet Union values the strong ties with India and the closeness of our countries' positions on key problems of the present day. We continue to follow unswervingly the principles and provisions of the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation.

The traditionally good relations between the USSR and India are called upon to continue serving our countries' interests and the desire of all peoples for concord and security.

With sincere respect,

[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

Indian Minister Meets Petrovskiy on Gulf 22 Jan

BK2201131491 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1230 GMT 22 Jan 91

[Text] The external affairs minister, Mr. V.C. Shukla, discussed the Gulf situation with the Soviet deputy foreign minister, Mr. Vladimir Petrovskiy, in Moscow today during a brief stopover en route to Belgrade. Both the leaders stressed the need for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. They said this is the only way to end bloodshed and open opportunities for a broad dialogue on all West Asia problems.

West Europe

Chancellor Kohl Speaks on Relations with USSR

PM0102143991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, REUTER, UPI, INTERFAX, and SIBINFORM roundup: "H. Kohl's Program Statement"]

[Text] FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, delivering the government program statement in the Bundestag, has said specifically: "The united Germany attaches central importance to relations with the Soviet Union. This is emphasized by the accords reached between President Gorbachev and myself in the Caucasus and aimed toward the future. The system of treaties and agreements between the FRG and the USSR laid a firm foundation for conciliation between the Germans and the peoples of the USSR. We will continue to support the Soviet Union in its policy of reforms, the consolidation of democracy, the safeguarding of human rights, and the building of a rule-of-law state and also in the transition to a market economy."

The chancellor voiced concern in connection with the situation in the Baltic, stressing that he "urged President Gorbachev most earnestly and insistently not to allow the further use of force and pointed to the need to guarantee the Baltic peoples' right to self-determination and the free expression of opinion, to guarantee the restoration of legality, a question for ways of resolving problems exclusively by peaceful means, and also the renewal of political dialogue."

Official Interviewed on Two-Plus-Four Ratification

AU0402142891 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG in German 3 Feb 91 p 2

[Interview with Aleksandr Dzasokhov, CPSU Politburo member, Central Committee secretary, and chairman of the Surpeme Soviet Foreign Relations Committee, by Jochen Kummer in Moscow; date not given: "Ratification in Moscow by March"]

[Text] [Kummer] After the latest events in the Baltic states there has been some disquiet in Germany that the Soviet ratification of the two-plus-four treaty on German unification is in danger. Is there a danger that the ratification in the Supreme Soviet will fail?

[Dzasokhov] Of course we are aware of the fact that the Germans are not indifferent to whether we ratify the treaty or not. We have already heard some voices in Germany that doubt ratification. It is important for our

peoples to agree to the five points that were signed. The package of documents is being thoroughly examined. The approach is not formal. From the political to the military aspect, and also the economic aspects—which are very important—all this has been thoroughly studied in the documents by our committee.

[Kummer] You are the chairman of the Committee. What results has the committee achieved?

[Dzasokhov] The committee has recommended that the documents be ratified by the Supreme Soviet. I believe—yes, I am firmly convinced—that they will be ratified.

[Kummer] But opposing voices have been raised among you that accuse President Gorbachev of giving up Soviet interests and claims.

[Dzasokhov] Of course, lively discussions cannot be excluded. But the issue is not the question: To be or not to be. The issue is the fact that a debate will generally help the documents to be accepted after a frank discussion.

[Kummer] When will the ratification be concluded?

[Dzasokhov] We will have the opportunity to deal with this during the fifth session of the Supreme Soviet (opening on 17 February 1991) in the second half of February. The ratification will take place in February, at the beginning of March—in early spring.

German Criticism of Domestic Policy Rejected

PM0402183691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 91 First Edition p 5

["Rejoinder" by correspondent Ye. Grigoryev: "What 'Consequences'?"]

[Text] Bonn—"Moscow Should Know That Continued Domestic Force Will Have Consequences for Foreign Policy"—under this loud-mouthed headline the newspaper DIE WELT carried an article by FRG Federal Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg. In it he campaigns for "the use of the Bundeswehr use outside the NATO sphere," comes out against the desire of many Germans to "make peace an absolute value," etc.

All this is an author's right, as it were. The arguments that are used are another matter. Above all, the minister needs something vague and alarming on the horizon. The Persian Gulf is still rather far from the Germans, but the Soviet Union is closer. Stoltenberg does not spare the somber colors to arouse at least suspicion with regard to the country with which the united Germany recently concluded not just a new treaty but a treaty of good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation.

The author argues, however, that recent events in the Soviet Union raise a number of ticklish questions. Well, everyone has the right to ask them. But it turns out that the minister knows the answers to them himself. "The Moscow leadership's important, positive contribution contrasts with the growing internal political crisis. The influence of traditional institutions of power, the party bureaucracy, the secret service, and the Army has become markedly greater," he writes. G. Stoltenberg complains that "Gorbachev has declared that preservation of the Soviet Union's unity is the priority task," obviously suggesting that the USSR president should not observe the demands of the constitution, as should any president, and even, indeed, any minister of the FRG.

The tragic events in the Baltic, Stoltenberg believes, have "destroyed certain illusions and hopes," which he evidently did not share. Since peace, recognition of the law, and nonviolence have not yet become automatic in Europe, he concludes, they should be fought for again and again via "political efforts" and military safeguards.

So, the necessary danger has been found, and steel appears in the minister's voice: "It should be clear to responsible figures in the Soviet Union that the intensification of internal repression and the use of force will have consequences for foreign policy." It has apparently never occurred to the minister that responsible figures in the Soviet Union are seeking dialogue, the observation of constitutional procedures, the continuation of perestroyka, and clear-cut democratic reforms. Is such a tone and a way of talking appropriate between good neighbors, partners, and participants in mutual cooperation?

True, as if coming to his senses, the FRG defense minister, by way of a distraction, assures us that "we do not want to return to the trenches of the cold war." But in effect he contradicts himself, making threatening statements about the Soviet leadership.

The other day in a government statement in the Bundestag Chancellor H. Kohl stated that the foundations of our relations are the well-known Soviet-West German treaties and agreements. They are aimed at creating an atmosphere of good-neighborliness, mutual understanding, and partnership between our countries. But against this background the defense minister's statement sounds like an unfortunate solo. G. Stoltenberg has been like this before, and official Bonn has even had to pull him into line. Let us see what will happen this time.

MiG-27 Crashes Near German Village 31 Jan

LD3102214291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1844 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Voronenkov]

[Text] Berlin, 31 Jan (TASS)—A MiG-27 Soviet fighter crashed today near the (?Hadehof) training area in the vicinity of the town of Zossen.

The press center of the Western Group of Forces informed a TASS correspondent that the plane came down 600 meters from the village of Schoebendorf.

There were no casualties or property damage.

The plane's pilot bailed out, and after landing was picked up by the search and rescue service of the Western Group of Forces.

According to data released by the Air Force Command of the Western Group of Forces, the reason for the accident was probably engine failure while gaining height. A commission has been set up to establish the causes of the accident.

Gorbachev Greets Italian Communist Party Leader

LD0102172991 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev sent a message of greeting to Achille Occhetto, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, which says:

"On the day of the opening of the 20th congress of the Italian Communist Party I am sending a friendly greeting to you. I and my comrades in the Soviet Communist Party leadership express appreciation of your persistent and tireless quest for new prospects of the development of left-wing, democratic forces in Italy and Europe. I hope that this quest will help communists, democrats of your illustrious country find original and effective ways of resolving problems, made urgent by historic circumstances.

"At this time, complicated and responsible for the whole of the world community, it is very important for the left-wing, democratic forces to live up to the situation, to cooperate closely with each other and develop a constructive dialogue with other political forces. "I wish you good health and strength in the interests of the cause, to which you devoted your life."

Latin America & Caribbean

Deputy Ends Visit to Cuba; Views Cooperation

LD0402121491 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Borodin]

[Text] Havana February 4 TASS—It will be politically illiterate, wrong in human terms and, in the future, economically unprofitable to sever links between the Soviet Union and Cuba, the head of a Soviet legislative delegation visiting Cuba at the invitation of the Cuban Education Ministry, said.

"During our stay in the country, we got the impression that Cuba has problems it can solve and that there are problems of Soviet-Cuban cooperation our two countries should address together," USSR Supreme Soviet deputy Nikolay Paltyshev told reporters at Havana's international airport before departing for home.

Over years the Soviet Union and Cuba have established firm relations and it would be imprudent to disregard the experience of joint activities, Paltyshev said.

Experts in Cuba and the Soviet Union are now working on ways to make this cooperation mutually beneficial, he said.

Experts in Cuba and the Soviet Union are now working on ways to make this cooperaiton mutually beneficial, he said.

Cuba helps the Soviet Union by accepting large groups of children who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl disaster and invalid soldiers wounded in Afghanistan, he said.

They all speak about warm and kind treatment by Cuban hosts, he said.

Medicine, biotechnologies and education are among the most promising areas of Soviet-Cuban cooperation, he said.

Castro's 'Loathsome' Leadership Cited for Problems

PM0302144991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 91 p 3

[Report by correspondent A. Teplyuk: "Long Bike Ride Ahead"]

[Text] Managua—The dissident "Union of Democratic Forces" has disseminated in Cuba a document analyzing the reasons which have brought the country to a "special period." In the authors' opinion, the present grave situation in the Island of Freedom cannot be accounted for by external causes—in particular, the disintegration of the socialist camp and the Soviet Union's own problems. "The steady drop in the level of production and labor productivity, the disappearance of basic agricultural products, and also industrial efficiency must not be blamed on external factors. For the past 25 years Cuba enjoyed the fruits of a special relationship with the USSR which placed the country beyond the reach of the international situation. If, even in this case, things in the country got worse and worse and debts increased to $35 billion, then only the loathsome leadership of the government headed by Comandante Fidel Castro can be held responsible for this."

One of the measures envisaged by the government within the framework of the "special period" is the extensive use of bicycles, which will help to overcome the acute fuel crisis. This year China will supply Cuba with approximately 200,000 "Flying Dove" bicycles—known throughout the world for their reliability and moderate price. Cuba has already received 70,000 products of this brand, and F. Castro has already been photographed beside a Chinese bicycle.

Political & Social

Leaders Comment on Federation Council Talks

LD0102175191 Moscow TASS in English 1721 GMT 1 Feb 91

[By TASS world service correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—Most of the participants of the USSR Federation Council meeting in the Kremlin today praised the council's work in interviews with TASS during a brief recession.

Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev called the Federation Council the most important political body in the new power structure and the renewed Soviet Union. "Its importance is great already, by the fact that it is discussing the draft union treaty," Yanayev said.

He noted that the federation council was closely examining the draft union treaty prepared by a group of experts. "The draft is a substantial piece of work, providing a basis where work can be done in a quiet, impartial, business-like atmosphere. This is exactly the atmosphere prevailing today".

The draft being considered by the federation council meets most of the requirements of Soviet Republics, according to Byelorussian President Nikolay Dementey. The draft proceeds from the recognition that republics act as sovereign states and join the union on a strictly voluntary basis.

Powers vested in the federal centre are to be defined by republics. They will transfer to the centre only what republics believe is better done together, in conjunction," Dementey said.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin had to attend the Russian Parliament Session, so Russia was represented at today's Federation Council by Yeltsin's first deputy Ruslan Khasbulatov. In an interview with TASS, he expressed hope that federation council members would be able to overcome the distrust that arose from events in the Baltics, which ran contrary to decisions made at the previous council meeting. Khasbulatov said he believed the Soviet President had been unaware of the intention to use force in Vilnius. He said much effort would be required to make the federation council really effective.

Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar said he was attending the federation council meeting primarily to discuss the situation in the Baltics. On prospects for his further participation in the federation council activity, he said that they will be linked to the results of the Estonian referendum scheduled for March 3 by the Estonian Parliament.

Mintimer Shaymiyev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tataria—an autonomous republic, which is now acting with regard to Russia as Russia is acting with regard to the union—stressed that Tataria intended to sign the union treaty on a par with Russia and other republics. According to him, one of the central problems of the union treaty is the property issue, because he who has property has power. Shaymiyev noted considerable progress made in the work on the union treaty lately.

Federation Council members ended the discussion of the union treaty and began discussing the situation in the Baltics.

Meeting Analyzed

LD3101190891 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS world service commentator Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—The meeting of the Soviet Federation Council on Friday must trace a high peak in the jaggered graph of Soviet political life since the beginning of 1991. The agenda of the meeting seems less than sensational but it must provide answers on current reforms.

The little that is already known about the upcoming meeting is that the leaders of Soviet republics, the Soviet president and vice president are due to decide three major questions: the division of powers betwen the centre and republics, the composition of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the forthcoming price rises.

According to Vyacheslav Sechagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, most aspects of the forthcoming reform have already been coordinated with republican committees. What remains to be decided is the size of, and the procedure for paying, compensation to the population after prices rise.

Each item on the agenda is so substantial that it could command a separate meeting. But the significance of the Friday gathering, given special powers by the December Congress of the People's Deputies, is not in this fact alone. The council will be put to a test of its viability as a new federal body created to decide the vital problems of the union, republics and the nation as a whole. This, in my view, is the main significance of tomorrow's meeting.

Events in the Baltics marred the prestige of the Federation Council. Indeed, later on January 12, the Federation Council decided to "seek political ways out of the crisis in Lithuania". It sent a delegation headed by the leaders of two union republics. The delegation was on the road to Vilnius when bloodshed began there.

These events called into question the authority of the council, that had been entrusted by the Congress of People's Deputies with the handling and settling of disputes around the country.

The investigation is bound to expose those to blame for the bloodshed in Vilnius, but coincidences of this kind appear to be symptomatic of a deep malaise. These developments give rise to distrust—republics will distrust the centre, the centre will distrust republics, and

can be expected to take tougher stands on many key questions, and the country's population as a whole will distrust the Federation Council as a body of state authority.

Such a scenario, I am sure, does not meet the interests of any parties to Friday's meeting. The obvious need to develop trust evokes hope that the meeting may find delegates intent on cooperation and the recent past will not overshadow concern for the future. The USSR Federation Council must come into its own as the country's new political headquarters.

CPSU Members Address Joint Party Plenum

Prokofyev Views Opposition

PM0402162191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] Assessing the present situation, it is time for us at last to proceed from the assumption that a new stage has begun in the covert war developing for the past two years in a planned and calculated way according to a clearly elaborated scenario, Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom [city committee], said, opening the debate. This war is allegedly being conducted against the party. But in fact it is against the basic vital structures of our society. And society is beginning to understand this at last, albeit slowly and agonizingly.

Attempts to form parallel state structures and form blocs of political organizations opposed to the CPSU have become reality. All this is being done behind the smoke screen of an alleged backlash or failure of perestroyka. On the basis of the "Democratic Russia" movement, a new all-union political party is being formed with a vertical organizational structure and primary cells in labor collectives. The fact that forces opposed to the CPSU are capable of action was shown by the mass rally in Moscow 20 January. It was unambiguously stated there that the time has come to openly oppose the leadership headed by Gorbachev, to take power in the center, and to renounce the socialist choice. The overwhelming majority of slogans were clearly antipresidential and antisocialist in character. People have gambled on Yeltsin as the central political figure.

It is a question not only of the shadow economy's real influence on life but also of the appearance of a "shadow" policy. The conceptual elaboration of the strategic line is being conducted by a number of leaders of the Interregional Deputies Group who formed the opposition forces' so-called think tank. They include Deputies Burbulis, Bogomolov, Shmelev, Popov, Sobchak, Starovoytova, Volkogonov, Zaslavskaya, and a dozen other names well known to us.

"Democratic Russia" links the strengthening of its positions to the creation of a strong axis linking Moscow, Leningrad, and other large Russian cities. The cementing role here is assigned to the Russian parliament, whose leadership is carrying out the accelerated conclusion of bilateral agreements between the republics and is taking the initiative in creating a so-called community of sovereign states. An attempt is being made to split the powers of the present central leadership. There is talk of creating a republican army and of removing the law enforcement agencies from the jurisdiction of the central leadership.

An attempt is being made to replace the referendum on the Union treaty by a referendum on the new Russian Constitution. In the opinion of the authors of this idea, that will make it possible to achieve the legal strengthening of Russia's new statehood and encourage similar processes in other republics. Bellicose separatism in the Baltic region is being actively used to whip up anti-center feelings in Russia's large industrial cities. Appeals are being made for mass demonstrations, rallies, strikes, and civil disobedience and scenarios are being played out that in many ways mirror the way communist governments were overthrown in a number of East European countries.

Even this fleeting glance at the activity of the opposition forces is enough to see that behind these outwardly disparate events there is in fact a carefully conceived and well structured logic of political struggle, Yu.A. Prokofyev noted. In conditions of a massive attack on the sociopolitical system and the party and in conditions where our opponents spurn no dubious methods and refuse reasonable compromises in the interests of civil accord, the CPSU has no choice but to accept the challenge and enter the political struggle.

We must preserve the CPSU's social base. We cannot do that without a precise definition of the party's program goals. They must be clear and comprehensible to people, and without Communists' participation in the solution of society's specific problems. We must accelerate the elaboration of the CPSU Program. A party without a program is not a party. And our party must be the guarantor of stability in the country as the only political force defending the preservation of the socialist state. Furthermore, we need not simply market tactics but an economic strategy. We must take it to worker collectives and first and foremost to workers in state industrial and scientific research institutions and collective and state farms, otherwise the party will have no social base.

What could our party organizations' actions be directed toward? Efforts could be channeled into restoring the severed economic ties between enterprises and the struggle to preserve the integrity of labor collectives, particularly in sectors providing the people with vital

services. It is extremely necessary to initiate state programs for the development of basic scientific research and the preservation of intellectual and cultural potential and to join in the implementation of social programs. We need our own concept for ensuring people's social protection the CPSU could offer society through parliament and, having gained society's support, begin implementing.

Next, we cannot allow the creative intelligentsia to be split from the party, as our opponents are trying to do. This will not happen if the party manages to take an effective part in the solution of the intelligentsia's problems, particularly now, when they are being aggravated by the transition to market relations.

Here is yet another most important point. We must not lose the initiative in shaping public opinion. It is impossible not to see how tired people are of the endless psychological stress, of intimidation based on the threat of coups and civil wars, and of the unstable economic and political situation as a whole. It is clear that the people's lack of emotional balance is a favorable background for the destruction of our social system.

Finally, we must realize that the CPSU's opponents have skillfully replaced pluralism and glasnost with genuine psychological warfare against their own people.

The party's position and view of a particular event or problem must not reach people late, as happened with events in Lithuania. It is necessary to respond immediately to the most acute political events.

One last point. The party is only a party when it acts as a single coordinated political mechanism. The autonomy of its primary, oblast, city, and republican organizations does not mean that they are uncoordinated. It is necessary to understand one another's problems, to be ready to help and support comrades, and to put forward a common strategy from common principled positions. Only then can we be sure of success in the transformation of our society begun by the party.

Ukraine's Gurenko Addresses Plenum

PM0402164791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition pp 3-4

[Speech by S.I. Gurenko, member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] The situation in the country, S.I. Gurenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, began his speech, is not improving and there is not even an appreciable tendency for it to stabilize as yet. The polarization of political forces—its range cannot be described as extensive—has been completed. Opposition forces generally join forces and begin to operate on anticommunist positions. The following expression is in vogue in the Ukraine, for instance: "There are only two parties—the Communist and the anticommunist party." Political disagreements develop into direct confrontation over anything.

In people's perception their own everyday troubles are closely interwoven with the dangerous development of events in other republics, above all in the Baltic, and the war in the Near East. But the center's reaction to this is often delayed and is not always comprehensible to the population. Often people simply do not accept its stance because of its woolliness and vagueness. The ensuing vacuum is filled with biased, one-sided information and the fanning of feelings of panic, melancholy, and futility—these are two interconnected and interpenetrating processes.

We must prevent any actions that might result in an escalation of violence—and not only in the Baltic, moreover. We must not facilitate this ourselves, wittingly or unwittingly. I think that today we should be more vigorous in displaying solidarity with our party comrades who are being persecuted in this region in a most flagrant, uncivilized, and dangerous way and offer them political and moral support.

How many times did actual communist parties' representatives speak about human rights violations in the Baltic republics—both at the CPSU Congress and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies? They did not merely speak but yelled about them and cited appalling facts. There has been no effective reaction to this! I think that to some extent this was aso the reason for the creation of the national salvation committees, that even if they have been repudiated to a considerable extent, are nevertheless presented as the devil incarnate by some forces. I cannot help but say once again that the "democrats" who came to power in the Western oblasts of the Ukraine are, like their Baltic confederates, violating the Constitution and Soviet laws with impudence and impunity. Their actions are ostentatious, defiant, and provocative. They are clearly provoking a sharp retaliatory reaction.

The Union government must pursue a policy of state leadership more consistently and ensure the guaranteed observance of the constitutional human rights of all nationalities, all citizens, and servicemen. All sluggishness and inconsistency are inadmissible, particular ahead of the Union referendum on attitudes to the USSR. If prompt, consistent, and perceptible steps are not taken—and I want to stress steps that the people understand—to stabilize the political and socioeconomic situation in the country, even unbiased people might say: "Why do we need this kind of Union if it lacks order?

The speaker then critically analyzed the state of the mass media in the country and the party press' inability to react promptly to opposition press articles. I think, he

said, that our central publications should be more active in revealing the true complexion of politicians with dubious reputations, along with their defenders.

One should not fail to consider either that Central Television enjoys virtually absolute trust among the viewers. If the state mass media continue to carry their state-funded sermons money aimed at undermining the foundations of our state, this will simply go beyond the bounds of common sense.

Switching to directions of CPSU political activity in the present conditions, S.I. Gurenko stressed the danger of resorting to the previous, grievous "tried" methods of work in the quest for a way out of the crisis and called for people to observe self-restraint. We must switch to a new quality and take into consideration the fact that society has changed and conditions have changed. If we do not do this, we will, to put it mildly, be bad politicians.

The speaker then dwelt on some socioeconomic questions. Concern at the changes coming in economic, production, and administrative relations is growing among the population and in labor collectives, he said. I am deliberately not using the term "transition to the market." Not because I am against the market or do not recognize the market. You must understand that every collective and every worker will not be able to fully realize their potential in 500 days in market economy conditions. There will be no prosperity either for one simple reason—lack of a whole series of conditions governing the normal functioning of the market. The main one being something that the ringing concept of "market infrastructure" often conceals—lack of preconditions for free relations between consumers and producers: owing to the fairly low level of development of our economy, which is still unable to provide consumers with a wide choice and wide range of high quality goods. But we cannot trade on the foreign market because most consumers simply lack hard currency. That is why rash privatization will do nothing but harm, in my view. This is collectivization "in reverse," and we must say this clearly today. Nor should one forget that every enterprise has a labor collective with a top-priority and undisputed right to own its "own" means of production.

I think that it is time for us to clearly define priorities in our policy which Communists should fight to implement. Primarily, of course, members of the government. In my opinion, the accelerated development, or rather revival—both social and spiritual—of the countryside is just such a priority. This approach is all the more necessary since criticism of Communists is growing in our republic's rural areas, for instance, and louder and louder demands are being made (to Communists) to restore order. Another priority area is the provision of normal housing conditions and consideration for the development of the rising generation. I will not weary you with statistics: You all know the sorry state that our schools, preschool establishments, and special education and health base are in. I think everyone realizes that whatever society we are building it will perish if we do not show concern, if we do not even direct the scant resources at our disposal into rearing physically and morally healthy successors, our successors, our future.

Vilnius Communist Demands Action

PM0502091191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by V.A. Antonov, secretary of the Vilnius scientific research institute of radio measuring instruments party committee, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] They keep trying to tell us that interethnic strife is at the root of the conflict, the crisis that has unfolded in Lithuania. V.A. Antonov, secretary of the Vilnius Radiometry Instruments Research Institute party committee, said. You do not have to be a major politician to see that the main factors are social conflict, the war of laws, and the current republic leadership's separatist policy. And this is the foundation that remains in our republic. All the talk about the stabilization of the situation in our republic is groundless. The crisis is developing and going deep. That is why the council of secretaries of party organizations and enterprise party committees in Vilnius instructed me to convey to you its appeal to the participants of today's CPSU Central Committee plenum. It notes, in part, that the well-known events of 12-13 January, which were provoked by the Landsbergis parliament and ended in grief for the Lithuanian people, did not contribute to the resolution of the contradictions that had accumulated, but made the confrontation in society even worse. The change of government did not make the crisis less acute, since parliament and its antipopular policy were and remain the chief source of instability and of the deterioration of the socioeconomic situation in the republic.

Endeavoring to obtain new political dividends from the blood of innocent victims, Landsbergis and his team have launched a powerful campaign of harassment and persecution of Communists, progressive figures, and ordinary people in Lithuania dedicated to the ideas of Union unity and the socialist choice.

Sociopolitical confrontation and interethnic strife are deepening in the republic at the moment, the appeal says. This is being actively aided by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, effectively declared a state of war with the Soviet Union, has embarked on the creation of a volunteer liberation army, and has outlawed the Lithuanian Communist Party. The fueling of tension, combined with the uncertainty and ambiguity of the political situation, is bound to lead to another social explosion, inevitably turning into civil war, into major bloodshed.

The council of Vilnius party committee secretaries, taking into account the opinion of the majority of Communists in the Lithuanian capital, proposes that the CPSU Central Committee plenum:

First, place before the USSR president the question of introducing temporary presidential rule in Lithuania as the only real means of getting the republic out of the very acute social and political and economic crisis and ensuring that the USSR Constitution and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitutions remain effective in Lithuania.

Second, ensure the social and legal protection of Communists and members of their families. Prevent the illegal elimination of party committees at republic enterprises in order to implement the president's decree "On the Lithuanian SSR Law 'On Political Parties.'"

Third, demand that Communist M.S. Gorbachev, as USSR president, ensure the immediate disarmament and disbandment of all illegal troop formations in Lithuania.

Fourth, voice an opinion on the conduct of a poll in Lithuania on 9 February, replacing the 17 March all-Union referendum, and instruct Comrade Gorbachev to express it in the media.

In our republic party committees have been expelled from the premises of many enterprises, even enterprises of union status. After the Territorial Defense Department was placed under guard, lists of Communists and members of other parties—social democratic, Christian democratic, and so on—were promulgated. They provide full descriptions of people, of all their positive and negative qualities, and so on.

Very soon, that is on 9 February, a public opinion poll will be conducted in Lithuania where only the republic's inhabitants who are entitled to Lithuanian citizenship or are citizens of the Lithuanian Republic and not the Lithuanian SSR will be questioned. The question is as follows: The Lithuanian state is an independent democratic republic? There is no question about the way one views the Soviet Union. And the question it puts is so ambiguous that anyone who answers it in the negative will appear both a nondemocrat and an opponent of independence. Could anyone oppose that? No. However, we, the council of Vilnius party committee secretaries, believe that participation in this poll would torpedo the 17 March referendum.

The Lithuanian democratic public sees the illegal substitution of a poll for the referendum and the ambiguous wording of the poll as a political trick by the Landsbergis group to hold on to power. And as an attempt to torpedo the 17 March 1991 referendum on the question of preserving the USSR's unity.

A USSR presidential decree declaring that the poll is illegal and has no juridical implications would help everyone in Lithuania to determine more accurately his attitude toward the poll and to make a deliberate choice: to participate in the vote or not to participate in the vote and how to vote.

Kalinina on Threats of Capitalism

PM0502095991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by Ye.I. Kalinina, secretary of the Leningrad party obkom, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] The viewpoint of our party obkom [oblast committee] and control and auditing commission, Ye.I. Kalinina, secretary of the Leningrad party obkom, stated in her speech, is expressed in the statement "on the current political moment." This statement was published in PRAVDA and contains a number of constructive ideas and proposals and I would ask the Drafting Commission to consider it when elaborating the final document of our plenum.

One of the provisions of the statement was the demand that the CPSU Central Committee plenum give an assessment of the deployment of political forces in society. The initial position here is the recognition that political confrontation in society has turned into civil confrontation. This is a confrontation between the forces of socialist choice and the political structures geared toward the resurrection of the system of exploitation and the arrogation by some people of the result of the labor of others. The events in the Baltic and the anticommunist campaign unleashed in soviets of all levels can be assessed through the prism of that struggle.

It is possible, the speaker continued, to assess all this as a tactically conceived act of political provocation and not to succumb to it. But today at the level of mass, daily awareness, whatever may happen in our society—any errors by the country's leadership, by the Supreme Soviet, are associated with the party and its Central Committee. It must be said that to this day there is no honest history of our party and people still do not know it. Unfortunately, in the party with its 100-year history there have also been crimes. There have been decisions dictated by historical necessity and there have been great exploits. Our historians and the large staff of party Central Committee consultants, people with a high degree of scientific knowledge, are to blame for the fact that there is no honest party history. The constant subjective review of our own history, its discrediting, its reduction to mocking anecdotes and shameful topics signify the disruption of the integrity of historical cognition.

One problem in the work of the party and its Central Committee is the restoration of the party cadres' intellectual authority and the enhancement of their professionalism. It is essential for the CPSU Central Committee to create conditions for the formation and productive work of the embryonic party intelligentsia. This is a new formation with a high degree of political culture knowing how to unite general human interests with class approaches.

At the congress a lot was said about the need to activate the CPSU's theoretical work but unfortunately there have been no actions so far, the Leningrad Obkom secretary continued. Today former party Central Committee workers, Tsipko for instance, reject Marxism or Leninism as a general human asset, as a theory. And I think that we must investigate the modern communist movement ourselves. We must investigate Marxism ourselves—what is of abiding general human value in it and what was dictated by the specific historical and political situation, that we must unfailing reject right now.

It is essential to know how to expose provocative actions, to conduct an ideological dispute with mistaken people, to draw doubters to our side.

Right now the process of the hasty reorganization of the CPSU's scientific and educational institutions is under way. We must concentrate intellect, not diffuse it. We must form expert, independent groups of scientists and not spare party funds for the purpose. After all, unless the theory of action in our party is resurrected—and we must realize this—we will not suffer a tactical defeat but could suffer a historical defeat.

In generalizing the as yet scant experience of the use of peaceful forms of political struggle, Ye.I. Kalinina noted, the Leningrad Obkom sees one of its tasks in concentrating efforts on perestroyka in information analysis work. On the basis of existing links of this work it is expedient to create independent information analysis centers specially aimed at obtaining and processing data on the political situation in the country or region, on the correlation of the forces struggling for power, and on the CPSU's political adversaries. And here there should be an assertive struggle on our side, an understanding of the fact that there is no way you can escape the question "who will win?"

I should not like the call to master the art of political struggle to be interpreted as a slogan of political revenge. Today such sentiments do exist in the party and do exist among working people. We are told: The soviets are discrediting themselves. Incidentally, the Leningrad City Soviet's rating has dropped from 74 percent in July to 20 percent now.

But do we have a program of specific actions to take to the next elections? Can we form a new subject of power right now, defining professionalism, competence, and common sense as the main logic of political activity? Unfortunately not. And I share Comrade Prokofyev's view that it is essential to accelerate work on the elaboration of the party program.

But perhaps without waiting for the next conference or congress we should think right now about the need to create a minimal program, a program of actions for the immediate future, a program for emerging from the new impasse in which we find ourselves now? Without such a document we cannot go to the elections and prepare for them. It is essential to initiate a new law on elections with a consideration for a real multiparty system and the demands of the labor collectives that their interests be reflected. These are the questions the Central Committee and its apparatus can and must resolve.

Zhiganov Supports Decrees

PM0502105991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by P.A. Zhiganov, fitter at the "Tsentralnaya" mine, Partizansk City, Maritime Kray, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] P.A. Zhiganov, a fitter at the "Tsentralnaya" Mine, (Partizansk City, Maritime Kray), drew attention to Stanislav Shatalin's article "Fighting Evil With Evil" published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. This article, he said, has been discussed everywhere: At the pit face and the party city committee. Communists' enemies look you in the eyes and ask with a grin: "Well, is the saying 'Hit your own side to frighten the others' working?" They particularly relished the fact that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev chose his team from among those people and that virtually every one of that team "exposes" Gorbachev to the people as soon as he leaves it. Shatalin did the same. But as a member of the CPSU Central Committee he could have addressed our plenum. That would have been fairer and wiser.

Nevertheless, the speaker noted, we must not give in to emotion. As a worker, that is my advice to you all. We all swear love for our people yet we do not miss an opportunity to use such articles and speeches to stretch already strained nerves to the limit while at the same time hoping that they do not crack.

We workers, the speaker went on, approve the decrees and resolutions of the president and the government, aimed at stabilizing the economy and policy in our country even though to some they seem conservative and allegedly leading toward dictatorship. But my opinion is that this is not toward dictatorship but order. And such measures for stabilization in the state must be increased.

While I am addressing you, P.A. Zhiganov said, you are probably thinking what a conservative I am. Yes, I take a very cautious attitude toward such "innovators" and "innovation" as toppling from pedestals the monuments to a man who is sacred to me—Vladimir Ilich Lenin—and other creators of the state and party. I am also very cautious toward those who instead of socialism frankly offer me capitalism and a capitalist "heaven."

I also want to say that in those places where administrations of plants, factories, mines, and other enterprises have managed to preserve the party committees and primary organizations, the plan is also better and the political situation more stable because there is someone to rely on and talk to about tasks and problems. Say what you like, the majority of Communists are reliable people. For example, it happened that at the Partizansk city

mine in Maritime Kray that there was no money to pay for a full-time party committee secretary. So the mine labor collective council decided to finance the post of full-time secretary from the mine's budget. This collective decided that the party is necessary for the people's good and is preventing the country from falling apart.

The speaker went on to note that a Central Committee member must have complete, truthful, and prompt information. It is so necessary in his work.

Melnikov Streeses Need for Action

PM0502112191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by P.M. Melnikov, party committee secretary at the "Karagandaugol" mine named for the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, from unattributed account of speeches at 31 January 1991 combined plenum of CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission]

[Text] P.M. Melnikov, party committee secretary at the "Karagandaugol" mine named for the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, stressed that it is in the miners' collectives of Karaganda and, indeed, of the Union as a whole that the struggle is at its most bitter against the course that was taken by the workers' committees following the July upheavals, rallies, and strikes in 1989 and following the all-Union congresses of miners—the course of depoliticization and departyization of coal enterprises. We have 26 mines in Karaganda. All the party committees at coal enterprises are functioning, but at 14 of them, in view of the departure of communists from the CPSU ranks, there are cases where party committee secretaries have switched to part-time work.

I have not been working as a party committee secretary for long, P.M. Melnikov went on. It is my fourth year in the post, although I am into my third decade at my enterprise. And when they ask what a party committee secretary actually does, I have to say that, in accordance with the decisions of the 28th party congress, we organize all our work in the interests of people. Even now, at a critical time, when people have had three days to change their 50- and 100-ruble bank notes, they have been coming to the party committee, and we have found words of consolation for them, persuading them that money earned by honest means—in whatever sum—would be changed in time. Our arguments met with support among the labor collective, among workers.

I must say that the Communists I talked to before the plenum expressed the common opinion that it was a timely action and was not prejudicial to the working people—the true working person. At the same time, imagine, if you will, the following situation. The workers' committee, periodically "submerging" and "resurfacing," are working on driving the party committee out of enterprises. In fact, about three weeks ago the door of our party committee opened and the worker's committee deputy chairman brought in representatives of Kazakh television and said: "This is the party committee secretary, now ask him why he does not leave the enterprise." Having asked my permission, the television journalists interviewed me for the Kazakh television program "Us." They asked about a referendum they said had shown that 90 percent of those questioned wanted the party committee to "go territorial" and operate on that basis. But I said to them: "But we have this decision by Communists, practically a unanimous decision, in favor of the party's being at the enterprise." They asked: "But what is your moral view of the results of the referendum?" I replied: "Well, we take cognizance of it. And we believe that our work needs to be stepped up."

In my view, the 28th congress adopted some splended documents reflecting literally the entire spectrum of work with the masses. We in the provinces are still sometimes subject to the syndrome that is lodged in our heads: When will we get the basic instructions from the Central Committee and Politburo?

Our party has always had a reputation for carrying out all the tasks facing it and mobilizing all strata of the population, Communists, and party and nonparty people to carry out the tasks facing them. Perhaps, at this very crucial time for the country, one has to go back to the time when the Central Committee used to send letters to primary party organizations and issue appeals gearing them to the implementation of specific tasks. At the same time, as we switch to the market, what worries miners—as evidenced by last week's rally, held on the initiative of the Karaganda Oblast Trade Union Council—is the fact that no mechanism has been devised to compensate for the price rises and we will merely cause instability in society, instability in our work.

I would like to stress that Communists nonetheless hope that at our plenums we will elaborate specific recommendations and adopt fine documents enabling us to improve our work.

I think I reflect the common opinion, agreeing with today's article in PRAVDA that now is the time for vigorous action at all levels.

Prokofyev Holds News Conference on Plenum Results

LD0402165191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] A news conference by Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, took place at the Moscow City Party Committee. The conference dealt with the results of the work of the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission. Vladimir Korablev was present at the press conference. Over to you then:

[Korablev] Well, first of all, I would like to start this short report on the press conference with the fact that the results of the plenum, Comrade Prokofyev noted that the

plenum's examination of the current situation was not caused by any sort of special circumstances taking shape in the party or in society. The political situation in the country is rather complicated and it is swiftly changing. Too many problems have accumulated within the CPSU. And communists' demands addressed to the party's central headquarters as regard the future are becoming too pressing. That is why all these issues were discussed at the latest plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev stresses that the matter discussed was not some sort of deviating from perestroyka or substitution of perestroyka tendencies with something different. On the contrary, communists were discussing changes taking place in our society and mistakes that have occured in the cause of perestroyka. That is why Comrade Prokofyev could not agree with the position of Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, leader of the Russian Communist Party, saying that perestroyka has failed. The first secretary of the Moscow city party committee noted that the main thing in the process of perestroyka is to carry out an economic reform. The party is not giving up the transition to market relations. This process is being implemented already. Perestroyka can also be described by the party's departure from single-issue politicization in politics and ideology. The multi party system is becoming real nowadays. And nobody, I repeat, nobody, Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev stressed, is going to give it up. New political parties will be developing in the future as well. And today we must only talk about competition between various political programs.

At the news conference Comrade Prokofyev dwelt upon issues of holding a referendum on the preservation of the USSR and how to get our country out of the economic crisis, having stressed that this matter can be resolved positively only providing that our country's unity is preserved.

Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev replied to numerous questions forwarded by Soviet and foreign journalists. I asked him about the political situation in the capital at the present moment. Here is what the first secretary of the Moscow city party committee replied:

[Begin Prokofyev recording] The political situation in Moscow has stabilized and of late there have not been any problems. The Lithuanian situation provoked an outburst of Muscovites' discontent with the center's activities. You know that a large meeting was staged, an anticommunist and anti-president one. I have an impression that someone is stirring up the whole thing, so to speak.

Well, let's take the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies. The whole thing was moving toward consolidation. Popov and Sobchak delivered constructive speeches. And even Colonel Alksnis shouted: let's discuss Popov's progranm if it is a good one, and let's act, as it were, if we adopt it. And like a bolt from the blue came Shevardnadze's speech, completely opposite to a discussion was taking place at the congress. Everything got mixed up—the Interregional Group, Soyuz, well, communists, the Unity group, and so on and so forth. Everything started to buzz.

Let's take the Baltic republics. They were moving toward normalization to some extent. A referendum on whether to join the USSR or not was seen on the horizon. And then all the issues could have been resolved by peaceful means. And all of a sudden there was a Lithuanian outburst that sharply aggravated the situation in Lithuania. And there could be a good deal of such examples.

I will reveal this seditious thought: Given peaceful competition with those who call themselves democrats—and I am far from considering them as democrats, I think that the CPSU is acting more democratically to a large extent—given peaceful competition the CPSU is winning because it has more constructive positions. And that is why as soon the situation in our country normalizes as a result of constructive actions and, naturally, the rating of those forces who favour an alteration of our social and political system drops, seats of tension immediately appear. [end recording]

Radio Rossii Dropped From Moscow First Program

LD0102231691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2035 GMT 1 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Before we listen to the wise silence of the stars, we wish to inform you that, from tomorrow onward, listeners to Radio Rossii will not be able to hear it on the First program of Moscow Domestic Service or on Mayak. From now on, as a result of a proposal made by the leadership of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, it will be transmitted on the wavelengths of Moscow domestic Service Second Program.

More on Transmission Changes

LD0202054191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0515 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] Esteemed radio listeners! As of today, Radio Rossii programs will be broadcast on the Second Program of All-Union Radio. You can hear Radio Rossii programs daily from 1400-1700 and from 2200-0000 Moscow time.

Broadcast Time Cut 50 Percent

LD0302145191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Feb 91

[Text] Not only have we been removed to the second radio program, but today we had another surprise awaiting us. The daytime broadcast of Russia's Radio will last not three hours—from 1400-1700 [1100-1400 GMT] as is usual—but only an hour and a half, from

1400 to 1530 [1100-1230 GMT]. True, it is claimed that this is only for today. At any rate, we are with you for only an hour and a half this afternoon.

To Broadcast on Third Program

LD0202094591 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] At listeners' requests we are providing the following information:

Radio Rossii broadcasts, which aired during the past one and a half months at 0630 [0330 GMT] on the first program and at 1400 [1100 GMT] on Mayak, will, starting today, be on the air on the Third Program from 1400 to 1700 [1100 to 1400 GMT] during the day and from 2200 until 0000 [1900 to 2100 GMT] at night. This decision was made by the USSR Gosteleradio management.

Newspaper Editors Deplore Radio Rossii Ruling

LD0202204991 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] An All-Russian conference of newspaper editors was held in Moscow today. Among the topical issues, the closure from 2 February of the Radio Rossii channel on the All-Union First Program and on Mayak was discussed. Those attending the conference adopted an appeal to the president of the USSR and the Union government, the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]

The appeal says that Radio Rossii can now only carry its programs on the second channel, covering only 60 percent of the population of Russia. At a time of open offensive by reactionaries in the localities, the limitation on the activity of Radio Rossii must be regarded as a frank attempt to deprive a significant proportion of the RSFSR population of objective information. The participants in the conference see this as a profound violation of legality, in particular of the Law on the Press, and demand that this illegal decision be rescinded. The appeal calls for a speedy solution to the issue of offering the second channel of Central Television to an All-Russian state radio company.

Those taking part in the All-Russian conference of newspaper editors declared their support for the parliament and government of the republic and their economic, political, and cultural actions aimed at the renaissance of Russia's sovereignty and the development of mutually advantageous direct contacts with other sovereign republics.

'Vzglyad' Workers Seek Action Against Officials

LD0102190491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1731 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Feb (TASS)—Producers of the popular "Vzglyad" television series have sent a statement to the procurator's office of Dzerzhinkskiy Rayon, Moscow, instituting criminal proceedings on the grounds that "officials of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting [Gostelradio] have prevented" journalists on the series "from carrying out their legal professional activities and 'have made them give up disseminating information,'" the IZVESTIYA newspaper reports today. The statement refers to Article 36 of the USSR law on the press and other mass media. This popular series has not been broadcast recently. The leadership of Gosteleradio suggested that producers of the "Vzglyad" series work out a new concept for their program; however, they think that such an order is an encroachment on freedom of information.

As the newspaper was told by Levon Grigoryan, a juridicial representative of the "Vzglyad" series, Article 36 of the press law envisages responsibility in the form of a fine of up to 500 rubles. This is the first instance of applying it. There is no precedent. In the course of 10 days, starting from 25 January, the date the above statement was received, the procurator's office should make its position clear: whether it is going to institute criminal proceedings or come up with a well-justified refusal.

Gosteleradio Chiefs Answer Questions

LD0302225691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1930 GMT 30 Jan 91

["Direct Talk" call-in program featuring Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko, chairman of USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Gosteleradio; Petr Nikolayevich Reshetov, first deputy chairman of USSR Gostelradio for Central Television; and Anatoliy Petrovich Tupikin, first deputy chairman of USSR Gostelradio for radio; moderated by Sergey Lomakin—live]

[Text] [Lomakin] Good evening, friends. The "Direct Talk" program is on the air. Despite its late start, I hope it will rouse great interest on your part, since leaders of the USSR Gosteleradio will be answering all, I repeat, all your telephone questions related to television and radio. I hope their answers will be as frank and sincere as possible. By the way, since 1100 in the morning when a telephone communication with television viewers was established here in the studio, we have received a huge number of calls and telephone messages. This is only a fraction of the questions [shows a batch of papers]. Some of the questions are, naturally, with your interlocutors. For those who have just switched on, I remind you that our telephone number is 217-45-63. We are waiting for your questions.

Well, I will introduce the participants in our meeting. These are Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko, chairman of the USSR Gosteleradio—incidentally, today is 40 days since he was appointed to this post, so even 100 days of his chairmanship have not yet passed; Petr Nikolayevich Reshetov, his first deputy—his duties are to deal with Central Television's program—incidentally, in 1988 Leonid Petrovich, too, held the post of first deputy chairman of USSR Gosteleradio—and Anatoliy Petrovich Tupikin, yet another first deputy chairman for radio, who will answer questions relating to radio. There are two other deputy chairmen whose duties have to do with Central Television's programs but, as far as I know, they are on business trips abroad.

Well, I believe three main characters from Gosteleradio will be quite sufficient. In passing, I would like to remind you what USSR Gostelradio is today. There are about 90,000 people working within the whole system, in the entire country; there are three powerful kinds of broadcasting—Central Television, Radio, and Foreign Broadcasting; about 23,000 people are employed in the Moscow system alone; there are about 47 hours of original television broadcasting per day plus radio broadcasts and foreign broadcasting in more than 80 foreign languages.

I will not hide the fact that the extraordinarily unanimous recent attack in the newspapers against Central Television and its leaders was the main reason for this conversation. Such newspapers as LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, KURANTY, NOVOYE VREMYA—it would take too long to name them all—have savaged, literally savaged, Central Television and its program over the last few weeks. Central Television is being accused of veering sharply to the right in the last few days, of introducing political censorship in its programs and of removing progressive democratic programs from the First Program of Central Television. They are either being banned or they simply defect to other channels. Well, I hardly have time enough to list all the accusations. We simply do not have time for that; we have only 90 minutes at our disposal. I hope you will be asking questions, while I, having read all those newspaper publications, will moderate the program in quite a tough manner, maybe not very convenient for you, esteemed colleagues.

While you are dialing our number to get in touch with us, I will dare to ask the first question, or, to be more precise, to pose a question from the IZVESTIYA newspaper to the chairman of Gosteleradio. On 10 January, IZVESTIYA reprinted a letter from some RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Leningrad City Soviet deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for Issues of Glasnost, Rights, and Appeals of Citizens. The authors of the letter protested the new concept of braodcasting initiated by you, Leonid Petrovich. I quote: The new program is that of deliberate deception of viewers, an attempt to turn the people into an unthinking rabble amusing themselves with quiz shows, and so on, unquote. Let us leave the obviously unparliamentary utterances to the parliamentarians' conscience but, I think, the time has come to clarify once again the essence of the new concept.

[Kravchenko] Since this is direct conversation, I would like to give a direct answer. I think I must turn back the term deception that has been used, because the interpretation of my concept... [changes thought] although you will see a little later that this is an ancient concept, it is as ancient as television itself. In my view, here we already have a deception of readers. It is a question of nothing more but the fact that two kinds of broadcasting have always been arguing with each other: the nonfactural one and the socio- political one. Since 1966, when I started working in television, letters from viewers have always come to us demanding more films, plays, musical programs, interesting programs and, at the same time, criticizing us for showing too many socio-political programs. Even the term talking heads appeared at one time. People used to say: Whatever program you tune in, talking heads are everywhere. This is how it was then.

[Lomakin] We, too, can be accused of showing talking heads here now.

[Kravchenko] Over the last few years I think the situation has simply become more complicated. Our country is overheated with political passions, interethnic conflicts, goods shortages. Television and radio have started to show relays of congresses of USSR and RSFSR people's deputies and sessions of the union and Russian Supreme Soviets, of the Mossoviet, and the Lensoviet. It used to be that when, whatever the channel, you came across people standing at microphones or the main rostrum, arguing with one another, passions flaring up. [sentence as heard] Sometimes we used to broadcast all through the night until morning. I can quote a letter here: tough political confrontations, continous attacks on behalf of factions and platform, or nowadays of parties, heightens tension in society and splits it, deliberately or not. After watching those discussions, sometimes shown at night, we go to work in the morning in a bad state, trying to identify left-wingers and right-wingers around us.

I think that such an opinion should be heeded. But, we only now understand that this remedy alone cannot cure our society. One would like to invent another one. What we need today is an increase in the volume of nonfactual broadcasting. So, we have proposed showing a feature film daily, before the Vremya program. We have proposed increasing sharply the number of theater performances shown, musical programs, folk art programs, and of course, entertainment, quiz shows. "The Field of Miracles" is a quiz show and I know it is popular. It is presented by Listyev and, I think, he does it in an interesting manner. At the same time we would like to back political broadcasts, too, since there are many shortcomings there as well. Those who think Kravchenko is keen on distracting people from serious

political events with entertainment are wrong. Unfortunately, information services perform poorly on television. There are too few information programs. And now we are considering adding two news bulletins; one in the afternoon on scientific, technical, and economic information and another on international issues. You remember "The World Today"? We would like to restore international information. Still, I would like to ask the sacramental question: Cinema, a popular and mass form of art, is it for the rabble? Or are music and theater for the rabble? Are they cheap entertainment? Actually, Petr Nikolayevich, let us try to recall what we have shown over the last month—January and the end of December—of what is described as nonfactual programs.

[Reshetov] December and January are the most obvious case showing the changes that have been going on in television in favor of nonfactual broadcasting lately. Look, in December and January, we showed 21 new productions on central television, including such films as "Nikolay Vavilov" in six parts, a feature film evoking great reponse from viewers; :"Octopus-4" in six parts; "The Great Waltz" from the United States; "The Middlemen" made at the Gorkiy studio; "Pages From the Life of Fedor Kuzkin;" "Enter Every House;" a program of Disney cartoons; and "The Winter Cherry," that television viewers are watching now. Many television plays have premiered, including the "Diary of a Madman" by Gogol, "The Widow Kapet" by Feuchtwanger, "Cold Autumn" by Bunin, "The Roof," and others. Finally, the number of concerts has increased, including original ones filmed especially for our first and second all-union television channels. In December and January alone the overall volume of original nonfactural broadcasting amounted to 433 hours.

It is noteworthy that a growth has been under way in all nonfactual television editorial offices over December and January. This is cheering news, one must admit. If one is to speak about the accusations addressed to us regarding a change in priority favouring nonfactual broadcasting in our central television programs, I have already received several interesting letters. There are many of them, but I will take only the most typical ones, that I would simply like to quote here to show how viewers themselves regard these changes in our programs. Vladimir Nikolayevich Konstantinov from Moscow asks: Why not show all the films our people have been raised on all these years as a retrospective in a "Retro" slot. Or, for instance, Stanislav Konstantinovich Skripka from Vilnius: please, gived us more entertainment programs and less politics. The people are so tired of the talking shop and want to see nonfactual programs. The Krustinsen family from Riga says now one can have a little rest watching the screen and forget worries and problems, especially we Riga residents who are constantly kept in a state of nervous tension by local television. Or here are the Sorokins from Moscow: We are very happy that the programs have changed. They have become more interesting; there is a wider range of views. The fact that there are more feature films and nonfactual programs, in general, is most welcome. And Zaytseva from Udmurtia simply asks: Why are there still not enough films shown? This shows that people have a considerably greater need to watch these films, to watch. We have far from satisfied the demands that arrive at our central television.

[Kravchenko] Petr Nikolayevich, I think that it would be perhaps immodest to ascribe to ourselves a certain Kravchenko concept, or Reshetov concept. The thing is that this represents a basic reckoning with the television viewers' demands. They have always been here. If we want to take them into account, we must do this. A bad situation in cinema is our problem, though, and you are aware of that. Now the cinema studios have been granted the right of ownership of all the films they have produced, and it is with great difficulty that we are coping with this new concept of necessarily showing a good film before the Vremya program. Is that not the case?

[Reshetov] Our argument with the Union of Cinematographers about this issue has become too drawn out, for if one counts on the average, we need t least 360 films a year to show before the Vremya program, not even mentioning first showings. In fact, we have very few films at our disposal now. Regarding our studios, the country's major studios, they produce no more than 150 films a year. Our Soyuztelefilm, including commissioning and its own production, adds about 100 films a year, too. We are very short of films, and I think the viewers suffer because we often repeat certain films. However, our intentions remain, and we think that the Goskino [State Committee for Cinematography] and the Union of Cinematographers, instead of initiating debates with us in the press and publishing statements such as the one you mentioned in opening our discussion, should think more about a way to satisfy the demand of viewers, especially in Russia and in far-off provinces, as there are no cinemas in about 50 percent of Russian villages. People have no opportunity even to go to the movies there. The only opportunity they have is to watch television. There are 100 million television sets in the homes and apartments of our people. There is, perhaps, not a single village without television. They have the possibility to watch. I think those working in cinema must be interested precisely in making their output accessible to viewers, rather that opposing the above changes in non-factual broadcasting that are now underway.

[Lomakin] I beg your pardon—I would like to interrupt you because all this could be parried by the following from Comrade Grudnitskiy from Kerch: Strange things are happening on television—while blood is being shed in the country, television shows dances. Well, I understand you have already spoken about that, but I have the following question: Non-factual broadcasting, increasing non-factual broadcasting, requires greater expenses; everybody knows this. Can Gosteleradio afford such expenses?

[Kravchenko] Unfortunately, these opportunities have diminished. The same problem is in evidence in other branches, too, in both culture and science. The problem is that today we do not even have a definitive and approved budget. We are working under the conditions of a transitional period, when we have to beg the government, and hope to be given at least what we had last year. With regard to the dances, it seems that the same Aleksander-show program is being used to reproach us. It is a new and interesting slot we may have overlooked, Petr Nikolayevich, indeed; when truly dramatic events were taking place in Lithuania, we should have sorted things out promptly, and although the program was on the air late in the evening, even at night, these remarks are justified, after all.

[Lomakin] By the way, following our conversation about non-factual broadcasting, there is a question from Igor Anatolyevich Shishkov—it is a question for you, Leonid Petrovich. Are you aware of the state of the children's editorial office, its technical equipment? Do you know about its situation at the Shabolovka? He has in mind the fact that children s programs are, mainly, spectacular, and require great expenses and good technical backup.

[Kravchenko] This is a very unpleasant issue for us, as children's broadcasts have been our Cinderella for a long time. Only in the last few years has there been substantial help for children's television. However, their basis remains poor compared even with other editorial departments. Petr Nikolayevich, am I right?

[Reshetov] As if to confirm your words, here is a letter from the collective of a preschool establishment, from the wonderful Stavropol Kray: There are few programs for children on television. And here is a letter that we, adults, simply cannot ignore—it is from eight-year-old Vasya Gangusidi, from Moscow: Why are there few programs for children on television? There are few interesting programs for children. Or for example, Alesha, 11-year-old Alesha from Moscow, writes: Please, show "The Field of Miracles" program at a different time, it would be more convenient for us children. Children are asking for such non-factual programs, as this is an absolutely natural issue. We simply have to look for this possibility of increasing the number and quality of programs for children.

[Tupikin] I beg your pardon, but I am afraid people may forget about the radio.

[Lomakin] No, no, do not worry, I will give enough attention to radio.

[Tupikin] Well, I will be counting on you, then. I would like to continue what Leonid Petrovich said here about the concept. I hope he will not be offended, but the issue of a correlation between non-factual and political broadcasting on the radio was there even before you arrived, Leonid Petrovich; this is only natural for any broadcasting organization. And it is not true that we are somehow trying to reduce political broadcasting. I am speaking about radio. It is a question of enhancing the topicality and efficiency of radio broadcasting to allow it to respond to political events promptly, even instantenously. In this aspect, I think, the mobility of Mayak has increased, although certain hasty results in certain hasty conclusions. New political commentaries have appeared on the First Channel, and so on. I could speak at length on this subject, but I simply stress that this direction remains.

As for increasing non-factual broadcasts, of course we have been thinking about this already for a long time. I would simply like to take this opportunity to say that we are now receiving virtually tons of letters, practically all positive, in response to our very interesting program "Interlocutor" [Sobesednik], it lasts five hours on the Third Program. It is for veterans, elderly people, those who stay at home. It includes newspaper reviews, very important now, legal and medical advice, and so on. Or, for example, tomorrow will be a month since "Nightbird"" [Polunochnik], a new program, has started. It lasts from midnight till three in the morning. This program, mainly musical, caters for those who suffer from insomnia, stress, or who are travelling, or who simply need a warm human word. We receive very good response to it, too. And the last example. We have not modified the Fourth Program of All-Union Radio into the "Orpheus Radio" and extended its airtime by six hours. This a musical program based on classical music, classical jazz, operetta, and so on; that is, this program caters to different interests and various age groups. I think this is the way we will follow in the future, too.

[Lomakin] Esteemed colleagues, please forgive me, but at the risk of seeming rude, I must call upon you to be more brief. I would also like to ask you to stick to the facts, since this does resemble, in some small way, an account that the USSR State Committee for TV and Radio Broadcasting might give the TV viewers. It is, in fact, an account, but, nonetheless, there are very many questions, and that is why I will take the liberty of going straight over to another topic the questions revolve around, because there are very many of them. Irina Petrovna Nikitina from Moscow has the following question: KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has recently published an open letter from 60 figures from the art world. They announce they will boycott Central Television until a second channel is made available to Russian TV. What is behind this? What about you—do you not want to give Russia a second channel? Evidently you will have to answer, Leonid Petrovich.

[Krachenko] Yes, the publication is interesting in itself. This is because it is, evidently, necessary to now admit that just as this publication appeared in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA we have been having agonizing talks with the Russian television and radio company on whether the whole channel ought to be given over to the Russian television and radio company recently born, or whether some part of it. As far as I know, there was an accord before I arrived stating that the second program ought to carry six hours of broadcasting. But, claims to the whole channel surfaced, claims to manage it

appeared. I must quote some data that, in my view, must be objectively taken into account. Well, of course, once you have a company—and Russia ought not to be done out of its share—all the republics have television centers of their own. [sentence as heard] They have their own broadcasting and Russia, too, must have one. There is no question about it. It is another matter that we often perceived Moscow as the capital of the USSR and the RSFSR and the union-wide television and radio broadcasting was perceived as Russian broadcasting. We did our sums, and, indeed, what you get is that 70 percent and even more of current broadcasting on all the central television channels is broadcasting about Russia, for Russia, based on Russian materials, but we should not take comfort in this. Now the question arises: How is one, nevertheless, to ensure a rapid development of Russian television for Russia? Well, it is here that contradictions arose. I have no wish to conceal them. Indeed, there was a time when we agreed that six hours would be made available for the time being, during the transition period. This would be as part of the 18 hours of broadcasting done daily on the second program—six hours. But, Russian experts came to see how the television center is operating, the electronic one. Could it not somehow be divided? Could not some base premises be taken here, to ensure this original six-hour broadcasting slot gets off the ground. Well, it turned out that it is not possible. It is an electronic organism as a single entity. Then, the matter was looked at from the economic viewpoint. What grievances might surface if the whole channel is taken away? This turned out to be even more complicated. Our elementary mathematical calculations have shown that over long years up to 60-69 percent of the funds have been allocated from the union budget to ensure work of Russian television and radio studios. This is more than the relative contribution by Russia to the union Budget when speaking about all the spheres and branches of the national economy.

At the same time I would stress that other republics have been deprived in this sense. This is not a case of Russia being at a disadvantage.

I am saying this with all due responsibility. I could give the following example. Last year 226 million rubles [R] were spent on Russia. The sum is equal to the expenditure of all union republics on preparing and transmitting programs. Here are interesting figures for the five year period: Of the R549 million spent on new capital construction, 69 percent—R370 million—were spent on new facilities, That is, Russia's television and radio centers. I could continue this story. The point is not to have rivalry, no. An honest appraisal must be given, an assessment that would make it possible for us to take an attentive attitude toward the Russian needs, the requirements of the Russian television company. But, when some people say: Let us give a whole channel to the administration of the Russian television company, is it natural to formulate the question in such a way by the Russian television company and Russian government today?

[Lomakin] Excuse me, who would formulate it thus?

[Kravchenko] The Russian television company and the leadership, I mean the government of Russia. There is an official application on this account and even a letter by five ministers with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev's endorsement on dividing up state property, Gosteleradio. It envisages dividing it approximately in half and to take several complexes for the Russian company—here, the one where the all-Union radio broadcasts from, where the television is broadcast from, the one in Kachalova and Pyatnitskaya streets. There are a lot of things written there. Frankly speaking, we were very much surprised by that, since that means that many thousands of people, those who today work in central television and radio broadcasting, are to be thrown out. I must speak about this frankly and addressing Russian parliamentarians, too. After all, people are producing these progams today and suddenly tomorrow we will close a whole channel of radio broadcasting or an educational channel or that for foreign broadcasts. Our position is this: One has to understand that today second program has 18 hours of central television broadcasts. We have input from union republics with their programs and this channel is called a channel of interethnic communications.

Incidentally, we already have messages of warning from the republics. They even threaten us that if the program is fully given over to Russia, then they will cut it off in the republics, because today it interests us as an all-Union program, since we all participate in it and exchange programs. Finally, the channel carries sports programs; they are mainly shown on Second Program, including international programs; there we show congresses of USSR people's deputies, sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and many other original and interesting programs, the very same "Kinoserpantin," "Authors' Television," and many others. Where could we fit them, otherwise? We must trust each other here, and treat each other with sincerity to do everything professionally and avoid a situation where, while creating something new, we necessarily destroy the old. You know, during the years of perestroyka we used this methodology rather often, and one would not want it to affect our cause, which is still great and beloved—television and radio broadcasting.

[Lomakin] Understood, Leonid Petrovich.

[Kravchenko] This is approximately how I could answer this question.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Unfortunately I do not have this question, but I anticipate it, so I will take the liberty of putting it to you nevertheless. Is it not the case that the real reason why the Second Program has not, for the time being, been opened—maybe during the next month or month and a half it will not be opened—is that you fear that the Second Program will turn into a tough political opponent to the state TV?

[Kravchenko] Well, I will answer just as honestly. The point is that we are indeed concerned by this, but not as

far as television is concerned. For the time being, we only have Russian TV in the form of the "Rossiyskiy Vestnik," a 15-minute program. But, as far as Radio Rossii is concerned, we are alarmed. I would like Anatoliy Petrovich to answer this question, because there are very many grievances here.

[Tupikin] Yes, it is a complex question.

[Lomakin] Incidentally, Anatoliy Petrovich, I have a huge number of these, I do not know, a lot.

[Tupikin] Like you, I have dozens of letters on this.

[Lomakin] Please forgive me, incidentally I wanted to ask you this question. I was somewhat beaten to it. Raisa Ivanovna Zubkova from Moscow asks why Radio Rossii only talks about the Baltic republics. We, the listeners, would like to know about Russia's autonomous formations, about their customs, culture, and so forth.

[Tupikin] Well, this is a perfectly legitimate question. Well, Sergey Leonidovich, above all I would like to say, for the sake of justice, that the leadership of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, for the All-Union Radio, has done much, in a sincere manner, to help Russian broadcasting get off the ground. I was told this repeatedly also by those in charge of the All-Russia Television and Radio Company. I must say that there are interesting things there and talented people work there—incidentally, they are mainly from within our collective, and we never stood in anybody's way to make a free choice and to go over to work there. I am not a judge or an arbiter of the activities of Radio Rossii and I have no wish to take this function upon myself.

But I have letters in front of me here, letters demanding answers, harsh letters, I'd say. We were waiting for Radio Rossii, and received something like a foreign voice, Russia's Motherland, er, Radio Rossii is very like the Voice of America radio, and so on and so forth—I do not want to go on reading letters, but the content is more or less like this. So there are answers—I mean, there are questions, and I must answer them. It seems to me that one cannot have double standards, when one has one standard of appraisal for oneself and one's friends, and another for one's opponent.

I want with all responsibility to say that while we, All-Union Radio, are accused of being one-sided and tendentious, this is not so. We do indeed defend the position of a single Union and a single state, the position of our country's leadership, its president and the Supreme Soviet, but we present diverse points of view and diverse opinions, something that is unfortunately all but absent from the programs of Radio Russii. I do not want to dwell in detail—there is not time for this—but Sergey Leonidovich, I cannot but say that sometimes it is not just a question of political extremism, but of political hooliganism, when programs stage calls to shoot the communists who sit in the Kremlin; when there are discussions as to what best to do—kick the stool from beneath a communist with a noose around his neck, or pray for his soul; when there are simply unfounded, harsh and—I can't think how to put it—insults directed against top officials, about bloody hands, and so on and so forth. I sincerely want to hope that these are just growing pains, a sickness of coming into being that has perhaps dragged on a bit. One wants to believe that.

Secondly, the selection is very tendentious: One cannot struggle against the monopoly of one party while arriving at an even more pronounced version of a one-party system. A single point of view prevails there: Everything that our people do is inherently good, while everything the center does is a priori bad. That is what I would say is now happening.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Anatoliy Petrovich. I should like to interrupt our conversation somewhat here. I am obliged to do so, I think, for there are both critical and uncritical comments about you, and about us, too. Ivanov of Moscow: Lomakin reported accusations made against Kravchenko. I do not agree with a single one of these accusations. Those who accuse him are hypocrites. I blame Kravchenko for virtually preventing the broadcasting of material from newspapers such as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and the NASH SOVREMENIK magazine. Dmitriyev, Aleksandr Gennadiyevich of Moscow: hold firm! That is addressed to all of us. We have enjoyed television very much since you came in. We have been to America, so I can say that whole families watch television together there, too: We watch television together as a family now. Finally, a question for me, or rather not a question, rather a riposte: your program appears to be prepared according to a pre-arranged scenario—Andreyev, Aleksandr Petrovich from Simferopol. Esteemed Aleksandr Petrovich, I should point out to you, we have already announced that our telephone link with television viewers has been set up since 1100 hours this morning. A huge number of telephone calls has of course already come in; our interlocuters have some of these telephoned questions, and so many of these questions are used in their answers.

Well, since we have touched upon the topic of the Baltic republics, I should like to move to this topic, because it is also a very sore, a very painful topic for all of us, especially for television, probably. Here's the first question: Trubina, Yelena, of Moscow. Television has been covering the events in Lithuania and the Baltic in a biased and subjective way. What is that, a ban on information and facts? Well, the phraseology used is evidently that of the most recent report, the most recent interview in OGONEK. Petr Nikolayevich, Leonid Petrovich, over to you, please.

[Reshetov] Well now, from the point of view of the truth and from the point of view of the facts: To start with, I shall cite just a few of the main aspects here. The events in Lithuania were covered in various programs; "Vremya" and other programs covered these events. I can will all responsibility say that, for example, to date we have no material in our editorial portfolio that has not been shown to television viewers. That means all

footage, including that sent to us filmed by Lithuanian television journalists, that filmed by Leningrad journalists, and of course by our own Moscow journalists, our correspondents who were there.

Although the proportion the footage was shown, the ratio, of course, is another matter. But in any event, all material was shown in one way or another, and television viewers saw it. This seems not to satisfy people, including journalists working directly at the scene of the events. I even regret, incidentally, that little of this material could genuinely and fully reveal the truth about the events that took place. What is it that displeases our opponents, accusing us of showing far from all the material on the events in Lithuania? It seems to me that there are different interpretations of the word truth here. What is understood by the concept of the truth about what happened? I often come up against accusations—when we are preparing programs we work on them for a day or a week, where television programs are concerned—I often come up against accusations that we do not show the sources and the causes of the events that took place. These refer only to 12 and 13 April, the well-known tragic events....

[Lomakin, interrupting] January.

[Reshetov] January, yes, we all felt great pain. But in that case, the truth lies in finally sorting out what preceded these events. What were the prerequisites preceding these events? I have here, knowing that this question would be coming up, I brought along a selection of telegrams that came from Lithuania and Latvia, the same telegrams. And there are signed telegrams, too. Here are the signatures of 200 people. There are telegrams from individuals, and from collectives and working people and so on, and nearly all the telegrams call for one and the same thing, the introduction of presidential rule in the republic. How do the people who sent these telegrams on the eve of the events that took place in that self-same Lithuania justify this? On the grounds that a huge proportion of the population in these republics had been placed, as a result of the parliamentary activity of the new parliament of the Lithuanian republic. They had become social pariahs, like some sort of inferior people; on the grounds that the families of servicemen had been subjected to the most common discrimination. Indeed, it passes all understanding that they should be put in the situation of some sort of inferiors, be deprived of the residence qualification, deprived of the right to housing, and the right to go to school and educational institutions. This could have gotten the population worked up. It could have, but as a rule the people who accuse us of not showing anywhere near everything pass over in silence this root cause, this prerequisite even, exacerbating the situation. And I want once again to say just that we in effect almost showed everything on central television that was sent or filmed by our correspondents. And finally, I would earnestly beg the comrades listening to me now to note the following: When we talk about the events in the Baltic republics and the way we cover them, can we disregard the fact that our correspondents working in the Baltic republics revealed and showed very objectively and scrupulously the situation emerging there throughout December and November, too. They showed us everything that was going on there and, in essence, some of our reports shown from there raised the alarm, as it were, that things were not at all calm in the republics, that everyone following the events taking place there had to have a highly responsible approach. Unfortunately, this....

[Kravchenko, interrupting] Petr Nikolayevich, one must nevertheless agree with Sergey Leonidovich on one thing, namely one could gain the impression that there was a certain one-sidedness in the Vremya program's coverage. I, for instance, do register this.

[Reshevov] The last....

[Kravchenko, interrupting] Yes, at the height of these events. What was this all about then? From my point of view, as the main state channel we were nevertheless obliged to look at the root of the events, the source of the events. I would like to remind you that the Lithuanian leadership, the leadership of parliament, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, disregarded the March 1990 Congress of People's Deputies, disregarded every single presidential decree, every single decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet relating, you will remember, to the protection of rights, and the rights furthermore of the USSR Constitution and the Lithuanian Constitution. Today, there is the same powder keg there. We must honestly appreciate this today, too. Our specialists who came back—that's another charge laid against us—came back from Lithuania. They had been working at Vilnius Television center. They had set up broadcasting there because the technical center was not set up suitably. Broadcasting had to be set up. They came back and said that the situation had become no easier, rather had become even more difficult. That is the worry. It is the same powder keg there; an atmosphere of civil war remains. And what is needed, finally, is the principle of respect for the laws, the laws of the USSR Constitution and of the republic, and for all those acts by the supreme state institutions, that... [changes thoughts] the Vremya program was obliged to speak of this, if we really do want to look at the roots of all this.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Leonid Petrovich. I ask you once again to keep your questions as concise as possible, because we have already been on the air for 40 minutes. Time is an expensive commodity, unfortunately.

Why, in that case, did the First Program rerun the very subjective film by Nevzorov about the events in Lithuania, showing only one side of the argument? It merely inflamed passions. Was this the result of an order from above? That's a question from Vladimir Pavlov in Klin.

[Kravchenko] There was an order from above. I wish to remind you that a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet demanded that Gosteleradio screen a repeat of Nevzorov's program. The vote in favor was, I believe, above 400. There were just a few dissenting voices. The repeat

was screened. Therefore, it is very strange to read some reports, including some received in the form of telegrams and telephone calls, alleging that we did this off our own bat, that this was our own point of view.

As for Nevzorov himself, there are many specific requests—I have some of them here—from viewers who want to know what my personal attitude to Nevzorov is, who want to know what we think of his work. I would put it this way: Nevzorov is a very talented journalist. He is an independent journalist. His career has been very unusual. Initially, he was a strong defender of democrats in Leningrad, of new deputies in the Leningrad Soviet, of the Leningrad Soviet itself. Subsequently he changed his point of view. As you know, "600 Seconds" even became the forum for a kind of war between the Leningrad Soviet and Nevzorov. But I do recall that Nevzorov took a strongly anti-Communist stance. I won't hide the fact, and I deliberately use the word anti-Communist. He sharply criticized the CPSU. I remember investigator Ivanov taking part in a lengthy edition of "600 Seconds." He was perceived in this light.

After the attempt to kill him, Nevzorov became incredibly popular. Then, suddenly, Nevzorov screened his on-the-spot video report from Vilnius. He came out openly in defense of the servicemen. This was a different point of view. I know that some cameramen even said that the film had been planted, contrived, that Nevzorov's tone and language were too emotional. Well, after this, a stormy campaign over Nevzorov started. I would even describe it as a political campaign. Nevzorov was even accused of having started to work for the CPSU, for Gosteleradio, for a state-inspired program. Even that was said. Well, there were misinterpretations, and this was one of them. But I don't think anyone can count on Nevzorov as an ally today, as an ally for all time. He continues to be an independent journalist. I believe that his future work will prove this.

[Lomakin] Thank you. That is precisely why we have devoted so much time to him on our program. I have a suggestion that we should now give instant replies to the questions—30 seconds for each reply to a question. Why are you choosing only selected questions? That's from Rubleve in Moscow. Who wants to answer that one?

[Reshetov] Well, I don't think that we choose questions on a selective basis. It's just that it's fairly difficult to examine them all. By the beginning of our program, 800-1,000 questions had already reached us, and the questions are still coming in. Very many of them are repetitive. It is difficult to say whether our approach is selective or nonselective. But logic compels us to try and break them down into groups. That's the whole problem.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Leonid Petrovich, have you watched a day's television programs from beginning to end. If so, did you like what you saw?

[Kravchenko] Unfortunately, I must tell you that I don't often get a chance to watch an entire day's TV programs from beginning to end. In fact, I don't even manage a tenth of this. This is because I am tremendously busy.

[Lomakin] Taking advantage of her opportunity, Raisa Semenovna Belyayeva has a question for you. The Central Television staff has an unfulfilled obligation toward me, she says. I would like to arrange an appointment with you. How can this be done?

[Kravchenko] I can give you my telephone number. This is 181-44-45. That's my number at Ostankino where I spend most of my time. My other number is 233-61-61. That's at Pyatnitskaya, where I tend to be in the morning.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Are presenters and announcers selected in a special way for Central Television? That's from Iosif Matveyevich Zorich.

[Kravchenko] Of course, of course. These people have to have great professional skills, especially announcers. I believe the requirements expected of all broadcasters, of all those to whom this honor has been entrusted, have to be high. These are not political evaluations. The requirements are purely professional ones. Our announcers have to be telegenic. They have to have good diction, and much else besides. Actors have to have these qualities. Journalists, of course, have to be able to use their brains.

[Lomakin] Well, in that case, I have to address the following criticism to myself. Why is the "Vremya" program presented by presenters who speak so quickly? I have to apologize on my own behalf. I do indeed speak fast. Maybe, that's one of my shortcomings. The congenitally deaf have been completely forgotten. Since August not a single edition of "Travelers Club" has gone out with subtitles or sign language.

[Kravchenko] I am afraid we are to blame for that. Some time back we began special television transmissions for the deaf. On the second program we began transmitting the "Vremya" program in this form. The same was done with "Travelers Club" and other programs. We invite the leader of our society for the deaf to a routine session of the collegium so that we may consider with him—and they have some suggestions—how to improve the quality of television programs. We have, according to the estimates of the sociologists and experts, a huge audience of about 17 million people, the whole country. And we must respect that audience.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Will sessions with Kaspirovskiy and Alan Chumak [faith healers] be conducted sometime on television?

[Kravchenko] I, for example, am not a supporter of this. I know about the skirmish that is going on between the Ministry of Health and Kaspirovskiy, and as far as I know, Kaspirovskiy still hasn't agreed to a scientific experiment being carried out at the Health Ministry with the participation of Health Ministry specialists. That

dispute continues, and until we receive recommendations on the subject, I don't think we should make any hasty decision.

[Lomakin] Thank you. [words indistinct]

[Tupikin] Kaspirovskiy can be heard on the radio on the "Nightbird" [Polunochnik] program—not conducting sessions, but talking about himself and [words indistinct]

[Lomakin] Thank you. I hasten to fulfill my duty to the viewers. Already, I have quite a big pile of indignant, you might say, questions from viewers as to why you're still not discussing the "View" program. Actually, there are two piles of about equal weight, some in favor of "View" and insisting that it be brought back to the screen. What is your personal attitude, as it were, to your own decision, that is, the decision by Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko? Was the ban on "View" not due to its negative attitude toward our president, and so on and so on and so on? In general, the questions are all more or less the same. On the other hand, there are the people who ask what was the point of showing the "View" program on 28 January in Lithuania—that was on channel 5 evidently, the Leningrad channel—when the program helps to stir up events? First of all, we have a state television service, and so naturally it is obliged to represent the interests of the state. And if a program begins to harm state interests, using for that purpose the money it is receiving from the state to finance its activities, then, forgive me, but that is just not on. You were right to ban the television program "View." And so on. (?The other examples are much the same) so I will ask you to explain the situation regarding "View." This is very important.

[Kravchenko] Let Petr Nikolayevich begin, then I will continue.

[Reshetov] Actually, I have also received a great many questions, of a preliminary kind, from total rejection of what has happened to "View," and accusations against us, to support for the way we are solving this problem. "View" is an interesting program. And we know that it has at times taken quite a leading part in our investigations of matters of interest to viewers. In the three-and-a-half years of its existence, in all something like up to 150 "View" programs have gone out. Well, it has received a certain response from interested viewers, as it were, and we have received a certain amount of confirmation, and so on.

The development of the program has run, all the time, in the direction of increasing what you might call the profound analysis of problems that have been arising in the collective, the creative collective, of "View." It has become more and more controversial as events develop in society and become more acute and the situation itself becomes more tense. But, all that lasted as long as "View" preserved somewhere and in some degree what you might call the pluralism that it has itself constantly advocated. In other words, "View" quite often invited people of various political views and convictions. There were more new formats of "View", such as "Counter-view", partial roundtables within the "View" program itself, various people appeared; there were discussions and debates.

[Lomakin] The audiences watch "View" attentively, and so I don't think we need to described in detail how it...

[Reshetov, interrupting] Yes, well as far as—I agree with you, yes, I'll be brief.

[Lomakin] Well, now, concretely about the situation.

[Reshetov] The latest decision was taken—first, I'm against the question being asked and a reply demanded as to why "View" was closed down. The program is not banned. The issue whether or not the "Vzglyad" program will be retained depends not so much on the leadership of Central Television as on the creative team making the program. A decision was published, that I adopted and signed within the framework of Central Television, to suspend broadcasts of the "Vzglyad" program until a certain non-specified date. The date was not specified, but the creative team of the "Vzglyad" program was asked to ponder over the concept of the "Vzglyad" program and clarify its thematic orientation, to review its broadcasting, and finally to examine the mechanism of further cooperation between the leadership of Central Television and the presenters of "Vzglyad."

Incidentally, we called the idea of examining the mechanism of mutual relations and cooperation with "Vzglyad" a contract to be elaborated. That was proposed by the presenters of "Vzglyad" themselves. That was proposed, specifically, by Aleksandr Lyubimov, the "Vzglyad" presenter, who raised the question in the following way: Let us, finally, work out a system of relations, something like a contract we will conclude with you. After this proposal was supported, a concept of how "Vzglyad" 's stance should be viewed henceforth and how its work should or should not continue was developed within the editorial group for youth programs.

This decision was adopted, in no way banning "Vzglyad" or the broadcasting of "Vzglyad" for the creative collective; moreover, we came across a situation when the creative collective withdrew the latest programs of "Vzglyad" of its own accord, one or two "Vzglyad" programs. There is no ban on "Vzglyad" now, either. There is merely a consent of the creative collective itself and the leadership of youth editorial group to clarify positions once more during the time available now, to specify positions, to develop a contract covering relations between the "Vzglyad" presenters and the youth editorial group and the leadershp of Central Television, and to resume programs after studying these issues. Further work is being done on it.

[Kravchenko] Sergey Leonidovich, I think Petr Nikolayevich is not quite telling the whole story. After all, there's also the point that there is a certain disagreement in evaluating, for example, the results of the Congress.

for example, that was the reason, as has been reported, for not showing the "View" that would have been seen on 28 December: results of the Congress of People's Deputies. Those disagreements are natural, if only because all the presenters of the program are USSR people's deputies. Lyubimov is a member of the Russian parliament, representing the platform of Democratic Russia. There is nothing terrible about that—nothing terrible about that.

But when we're talking about a contract system, we're talking only about the fact that, insofar as that program is in the hands of one faction of deputies, it must regulate these contract relations. I'd just like to remind you of the presidential decree in July stating that we cannot allow screen time to be monopolized by any one party, political movement, or group, and that State Television and Radio Broadcasting must not be turned into a propaganda medium for the personal convictions and views of its employees. If there may be some sort of bans or frameworks, then they are bound by this document and this formulation, and we must not in the future, Petr Nikolayevich, in future we simply must not interfere with the work of "view." The choice of any subject, or, as we say, (?intention), is their right. There must be an understanding that other parties and other factions will demand their view in just the same way—their own view of state television.

So I would add this as well, because this is an issue outside the system, and a fundamental one.

[Lomakin] As we have begun to speak about parties, I, anticipating our future blitz a little, would just like to ask this question. Comrade Rostov from Moscow asks: I have heard that Comrade Kravchenko will dismiss television employees who have left the party. Is this true? Does television belong to the CPSU Central Committee or not? That is the question.

[Kravchenko] Well, first, Kravchenko has not managed to dismiss a single person. Although I have already heard a great deal—and I read these very publications—that Kravchenko is suppressing rights, and in general has established some kind of harsh censorship here on television and radio. But I can assure you that up to now no one has suffered, nor will they suffer, for these reasons. If someone does suffer, then it will only be because of lack of discipline. I have, for example, specific questions—we probably all do—connected with "Television News Service" [TNS].

[Lomakin] Yes, I have them.

[Kravchenko] You do, do you?

[Lomakin] But I wanted to deal with them later. But it does not matter. We can start now.

[Kravchenko] So, specifically, people are asking what happened with Gurnov, with Gurnov, the announcer Gurnov. Legends of one sort or another have accumulated around this. The point constantly under discussion was that in a TNS program Gurnov, for approximatly 12-13 minutes, read out texts that bore absolutely no relation to the video footage. During the 12th minute, by chance, neither the text nor the video footage overlapped. When investigations into what had happened began later, he explained it by saying that he had taken offense at this group of comrades, who in his opinion were not ready for broadcasting—and for this reason, as a mark of protest, he read in this manner. His comrades and colleagues have written explanations to me saying that they had arrived two hours before they were meant to broadcast, were prepared, and Gurnov himself turned up at the very last moment.

I do not understand at all how someone can carry out these kind of experiments, as it were, on television, on state television. these are elementary, I would say very crude, violations—not only of professional ethics, but of productive and creative discipline. And Gurnov was suspended for three months from his work as commentator—he is senior editor. I think that it is worthwhile his giving some thought as to whether domestic television is in the hands of our announcers or whether it is state television after all.

[Lomakin] As we have begun to speak about TNS, I have a whole group of questions concerning this news program, and moreover these can also be split approximately into two halves. The first group of television viewers feels that TNS needs to be supported in every way possible, and that this program should, in general, be saved, as it were. The other group thinks, generally speaking, that it would not be right for my colleagues from this program to stay with the program, as they have stated that the program exists under conditions of political censorship, accusing Petr Nikolayevich—you, in the first instance—of virtually exercising control over these programs. Please explain what is going on.

[Reshetov] The point is that TNS has been going out with broadcasts, three broadcasts, only since January. This is a new scale of broadcasting for TNS, and it has unfortunately proved to be a new one for the editors as well. If one speaks about TNS and its work now, and the complaints that are being made about this very intersting broadcast—that we support, and that we are attempting to preserve at all costs—then these are probably addressed toward its tendency to repeat.

It repeats, often without giving additional new news when it broadcasts. There is simply insufficient material to issue a news program, and the editors working on one or another edition cannot cope with providing for this channel. This is the main problem now arising for TNS.

The remarks that have been expressed by TNS announcers, especially in the mass media, in their interviews—where they are making complaints, and accusing us of introducing political censorship—are somewhat at odds with the crux of the matter. They are at odds, in general, with regard to the main thing. If a program goes out, a news program, a program that one would think

ought to be packed with information—and if at they very last minute it is put together from cuttings simply gathered from the most varied of sources, from the whole world, without any thought about them, without the commentator taking his own position, without the announcer taking a position—then this, first and foremost, is what has encountered opposition from the Central Television leadership. These complaints will be made to our employees at "Television News Service."

It is at least improper to say that this is censorship. If only because if all the news programs are looked at, their volume and the number of editions in hours, then this volume is so colossal that no censor, no dozen censors would have sufficient time to watch them. Everything rests entirely with the presenters' consciences. There is complete freedom of expression and point of view.

But another thing is striking in this situation as a whole. According to these interviews made by some of the TNS presenters, there was a growing barrage of accusations and fabrications made by them about there being some kind of closure, complaints of one kind or another, the prevention of broadcast, and so on, about things that did not occur in actual fact. We have always...[changes thought] this reminds me each time I read these interviews of the quite famous film "The Festival of Saint Yurgen" when the main hero constantly added to the number of floors that he fell from when drunk, and the more listeners who believed him, the greater and greater were his inventions.

I would like very simply to appeal to our presenters at TNS and to the editors who prepare this program and to all who are occupied with the program, simply that it would be better to think more about how to make this program interesting and how to respond to the need the viewers feel for some effort to be put into this program and for work to be done together in a friendly fashion.

[Lomakin] Well, incidentally, since we have already touched on the topic of news broadcasting, there really are very many questions connected with a comparative analysis, if one can put it like this, of the "Vremya" program with TNS. People consider that "Vremya" has become significantly worse; it is uninteresting, boring, dead, right-wing, conservative, and in general it would be possible to give a very long enumeration of this. What is being done to impart new life to the old "Vremya" program, that has unfortunately changed during recent times?

[Kravchenko] Well, you know, I think that our sociopolitical broadcasting, the program "Vremya," still lack two things. First, we have to fill them with much more depoliticized reports and facts. The main god, the main dictator, has to be fact. This is legitimate information; it is international standards in assessment. We really do have a very, very great lack in diversity of such information. In the international block, it is successful; it is successful in the highest degree. But not in the domestic block; there are many documents, events, some kind of forced readings—not just television, but also radio.

And second: I think that our news broadcasting and our sociopolitical broadcasting greatly lack socioeconomic, scientific, and technical information. For example, my plans include—and I have shared this with Anatoliy Petrovich as concerns radio—the creation of the kind of broadcasting, both news and sociopolitical, that might meet the current interests and needs of television viewers and radio listeners. I am speaking of social protection, in a market economy, when prices are already rising. We are talking about how to manage these processes; they are growing. When unemployment is, unfortunately, a reality—and it is becoming a reality—we are obliged to create, within the scope of news programs and thematic programs, broadcasting that might take account of these needs, I would say social ills, and might become the protector of the interests of the actual working people, our television viewers, all of the best sections of the population. If we were to do things like at one time, you remember, "Spotlight on Perestroya," within the scope of the "Vremya" program—telebridges, hook-ups with our correspondents from various points, so that life itself might live and come to us, but life with acute social analysis—then I think "Vremya" would then (?succeed).

[Lomakin] Thank you. We will break off for a quick survey. We will begin with you, Anatoliy Petrovich. Why is it that in recent months there has been a sharp reduction in the level of contemporary music programs, particularly on the channel specially designed for this, "Orpheus," previously the Fourth Program—Rozhnovskiy, musicologist at the [name indistinct] institute, Moscow.

[Tupikin] Well, we consciously embarked on "Orpheus" containing more classical music and popular musical creative work, the more so as we consider that there is a lot of contemporary music, pop music, on other channels—and, so people write to us, even too much of it.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Anatoliy Petrovich. I congratulate you; you squeezed that into 20 seconds! Kiselev, town of Samara: Does Gosteleradio have any prospects for the future opening of another program.

[Kravchenko] We would very much like to have one, but we'll need at least three years and many, many billions of rubles to create the entire system for this program. Incidentally, there wouldn't then be any problems with the Russian television and radio company. The question today is a technical one. If there were another, a third program, there would be room for all of us.

[lomakin] Thank you. Glukhova, Irina, Moscow: At present, films are being trailed that are going to be shown at the cinema. But what are invalids to do who cannot leave their homes? Will these films ever be shown on television?

[Reshetov] This question is not for us, but rather for Goskino and the USSR Union of Cinematographers, and

for our leading studios, the country's studios. For the moment, there is very substantial resistance on their part. They are demanding colossal sums of money from us, but we simply don't have the budget to settle with the studios for the showing of these films.

[Lomakin] So, unfortunately, we are forced in this field to refuse invalids; and they are not, unfortunately, in such a good position in our country.

[Reshetov] Well, the only thing we can promise our television viewers is that we are currently taking measures to broaden in all possible ways the production of films, and the commissioning of films through Soyuztelefilm, Sovtelefilm.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Mikhaylov, Viktor Nikolayevich, Moscow: A question for Kravchenko. What is your education?

[Kravbchenko] Higher, in journalism.

[Lomakin] As far as I know, you are also candidate of historical sciences. Shall we keep quiet about that?

[Kravchenko] It is a mistake. [laughs] I said I have higher education in journalism.

[Lomakin] So my information is wrong! Lizunova, Irina Stepanovna, town of Vologograd: If it is impossible to bring back the program "Invitation to a Fairy Tale," with Aunt Valya, then it is at least necessary to create something more interesting and entertaining for children, like that fairy tale. As I understand it, that's a proposal for television.

[Reshetov] It's a good proposal, it just needs to be taken into account. But at present I know that the program for kids is currently working out new options, both fairy tales and other programs. We've already tested it out with (?Leontyeva).

[Lomakin] Town of Donetsk, Shabultayev, Aleksandr Mstislavocich—I am sorry, perhaps I read the patronymic wrong, it's written very badly. I ask very much that advertisements be taken off television, or at least to have less of them. Then there will be more time for showing interesting artistic programs.

[Reshetov] this is currently an object of constant debate at our collegium, and in general at our meetings in Gosteleradio management. We are currently working out norms for the use of advertisments, although I have to tell you that economic life and the current needs of society are developing in such a way that they are constantly increasing.

[Kravchenko] I take a harder line on this. We simply don't yet know how to make proper use of advertisments. It even happens that a program is under way, and within that program—for example "Five Hundred." there is such a program—perhaps half is given over to advertisements lasting six or seven minutes. Literary programs—suddenly we see a collection of advertisements stuck on for four or five minutes. This is unintelligent use of advertisements, preventingus from appreciating the program from an artistic point of view.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Vasina, Vera Andreyevna: What happened to the program "From All My Heart" [Ot Vsey Dushi]?

[Kravchenko] It was simply closed down for the whole time, like many other departed programs—although this program was one of the popular ones, in fact. And perhaps today the need for such programs—pure, human, sincere, heartfelt programs talking about people—has increased.

[Lomakin] Stepanchenko, city of Moscow: Why has Comrade Kravchenko entirely changed the Third Program? It has become uninteresting. It used to be amazingly informative and interesting.

[Kravchenko] I confess. I haven't got round to that yet; I haven't yet worked on this channel. I know only that there is a blueprint, and we'll be examining it, a blueprint for a program "The 21st Century". This is an informative program; it isn't just built on educational material, but also on all popular science programs and programs linked with our culture, science. The remark is justified, but it wasn't me; I haven't had time to do anything to improve it.

[Lomakin] Thank you. So then, let's return to thematic questions, if I can put it like that. I just want to repeat that I have in fact already managed to sort many of the telephone questions into groups. I simply think that these are the main groups. In particular, on state television.

We often speak about state television now. Question: Whose interests does it reflect? If it is those of the people, it should not be subordinated to the president or to some body within the state structure, but to the people, via its representatives—possibly to the country's Supreme Soviet. Does it not exist on taxpayers' money?

[Kravchenko] This is a very complex issue. I think that it is not worth offering any opposition here. We should remember, at least we remember this ourselves, that if a harmony of interests is to be attained here then this should occur by taking into account the higher state institutions of power and by taking into account the real interests of the people. If there is such a harmony, then there are no problems for state television or for other state mass media. They should take into account both the decisions and the interests of the higher state institutions of power, and of course take into account the interests of the people as the higher interests for everyone.

So if the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, presidential power, and the Cabinet of Ministers fully take into account the people's interests, then no contradictions will arise for us. Because we, in our work,

are nonetheless guided to a significant degree, of course, by decisions of the Congress of People's deputies, the session of the Supreme Soviet, by presidential decrees, and by decisions, the important and fundamental decisions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers—true, it has only just been created, but it was the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Reshetov] I would just like to speak for a few seconds. I have a number of questions from the very beginning of our conversation. Who determines television programs? How does he work and to whose interests does he respond? Who has the right to determine priorities? An ordinary citizen cannot be permitted to sit at the round-table live on Central Television.

[Kravchenko] Well, Petr Nikolayevich, the surnames should be named of those who have sent in these questions.

[Reshetov] Yes. Popov from Moscow; Vasiliy Petrovich Ushakov on behalf of a group of comrades from the town of Chernigov; Zhan Fedorovich Musiyezdov from Makeyevka; and Nataliya Trofimovna Strokova from Moscow. You live by such a motto—think with us, think like us, but think ahead of us. What grounds does the leadership have for taking upon itself the right to decide on behalf of us—millions of viewers—what television should be like and what its programs should be like? Who gives you this right? I would like to add here that it is you, comrade television viewers, who give us this right.

According to the latest sociological poll—research that will incidentally be published in the governmental newspaper, in the governmental herald—80 percent of the inhabitants of our country want peace and quiet, want a normal life, and want order in the country. And we, in choosing topics for the country's television programs, are striving to fulfill precisely this demand among vieweres. We sense this every time we receive numerous letters.

We receive up to two million letters every year for our television. Central Television, our all-union channel, alone receives 5,000 letters a day with requests about program topics, with wishes and their own proposals, and remarks about these programs and so on. These letters represent the most concrete of links with the people. And most often precisely these requests by television viewers we receive in such huge masses that we have a huge collective processing these letters, represent this very expression of people's views in our programs and the choice of topics to be shown on television.

And I would also like to say that a television sociological service has already taken shape that first and foremost takes into account viewers' interests. This is sometimes the decisive determinant of whether a program is to be broadcast. In accordance with these viewers' interests, around 89-90 percent of viewers are today watching our first television program; around 60-70 percent the second program; and the leading, the greatest rating, the highest viewers' interest is in "Vremya"—60-70 percent of viewers watch it regularly, every day.

[Kravchenko] Petr Nikolayevich, I have several questions demanding a continuation of the discussion about state television. I don't know whether you have any, Sergey Leonidovich?

[Lomakin] I have the following question. Is there an alternative television on state television?

[Kravchenko] I have about a dozen questions on that subject also. Is it possible, and does it exist? Of course it is possible and it exists, I would like to confirm. What is the Gosteleradio? It was described at the beginning of this program in general. But Gosteleradio is also the Leningrad channel with its "Fifth Wheel," for example, run by Bella Kurkova, a well-known alternative; and, I would even say, an opposition program, to describe it precisely. Also, the Moscow channel where Mossoviet leaders Comrades Popov and Stankevich always have the right and opportunity—and on Tuesdays it is mandatory—to set forth their points of view. As a rule, this has an alternative nature.

The Second Program shows sessions of the Russian Parliament and many other programs including the above-mentioned "Authors' Television" these are, certainly, alternative television. On the First Program, too, there are a number of programs. These not only put a different point of view; they are alternative television.

Take the latest edition of "Before and After Midnight." I hope the viewers were able to watch it. The program was popular and interesting. Well-known Soviet journalists and cinema personalities like Elem Klimov and Yegor Yakovlev [editor of MOSCOW NEWS] took part in it. They used their appearance on this program, among other things, to express criticism of the leadership of Gosteleradio and myself personally. Elem Klimov reminded us in that program that they had signed a letter, saying that they would not take part in any more TV programs until the Second Program is given over.

[Lomakin] That was a letter signed by 60 personalities in the arts world.

[Kravchenko] Yes, yes, yes. However, I was surprised by something else, by the fact that less than 48 hours later Elem Klimov, who signed this letter along with others, did actually appear on TV. He explained that this was only because it wasn't an entertainment program. But, after all, the issue was not entertainment but the Second Program.

I think that should remain on his conscience.

As I understand it, Yegor Yakovlev was desperately canvassing his colleagues, including his close colleagues, and saying that he couldn't remain in the Union of Journalists if I was a member. I was also surprised by this; I was also surprised.

[Tupikin] Sergey Ivanovich, I would like to say just a word or two. I believe that one has to listen to all criticism, and above all one should seek the rational grain of truth in it. There is criticism and criticism. I was trained as a historian, and in the past I have made a fairly detailed study of Soviet newspapers over a long period of time. And when I hear phrases like "ban him from the Union of Journalists," "withdraw his mandate," and "sack him," this regrettably begins to remind me of the pages of the newspapers 43 years ago. I don't believe in responding to every unjust accusation made falsely and in anger. One should not. It seems to me that if people have an interest in an improvement of the work of radio and television, you can always sit down calmly and agree on decisions without bandying labels about and branding people with all sorts of charges. That is what I wanted to say.

[Lomakin] Leonid Petrovich, many people, journalists among them—I'm just talking of the sort of conversations there have been—want the journalists' organizations—you were nominated as their candidate for USSR people's deputy—to formally deselect you as a USSR people's deputy. Is that really true? Have proposals of that sort been made?

[Kravchenko] Yes, regrettably this has come to my attention. It was the Krasnoyarsk journalists' organization, at least a plenum of the board of this organization—as reported by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. And there is a similar mood in the Moscow and Leningrad organizations. I ask myself what these terrible things are that I have managed to perpetrate in the 40 days I've been in my job, to spark off such vehement talk of deselection. Mind you, there are several very strong comments here on this score. I have to read them out, because it wouldn't be fair otherwise. Kuznetsov in the town of Borisov asks: Is it planned to have Kravchenko confirmed by the Supreme Soviet, as required; and if not, why not?

Basically, it was planned to have me confirmed by the Supreme Soviet, but the trouble is that by presidential decree our entire Gosteleradio structure is to be reformed, and I admit openly today that I never strived to become a minister, chairman of the Gosteleradio. There are plans for setting up a company, either a television and radio broadcasting company or a separate television and a separate radio broadcasting company. I would like to work in television, which I like. In connection with this there will be no relevant post in the new Cabinet of Ministers. As far as I know, Gosteleradio will be abolished along with certain other ministries and departments that will not be present in the new cabinet.

This is from Nikolay Stepanovich Fadeyev in Volgograd: What job does People's Deputy Kravchenko think he's doing in combining his position as chairman of Gostereradio with his position as deputy?

I am not combining it with chairman of Gosteleradio. In the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet it was decided that since this post would not exist, and since I have not been confirmed by the Supreme Soviet, the two will naturally not be combined.

There is a very personal remark from Ala Petrovna Teplova in Smolensk oblast, who recalls that I once came to Smolensk atomic power station with a group of TV employees and gave the impression of being someone with progressive views—more a democrat than a conservative: Now that you are chairman of Gosteleradio, haven't you become a mouthpiece for the reactionary forces in our country's leadership?

That is a tough-worded question. I would like to assure Ala Petrovna Teplova that nothing has happened to me, and I hope to be able to prove that in the future.

There are other very critical questions: Are the rumors true that Comrades Nevzorov and Kravchenko have been awarded the international Dr. Goebbels prize? That is from Zaporozhye engineer Eduard Georgiyevich Krivshin. He was no doubt referring to an article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI that, quoting Yelena Bonner, said that she regarded me as a Goebbels.

Well, if that's democracy, then I have to congratulate such democrats! And there's a whole batch of other remarks like this. I could not keep quiet about them.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Since we have some time left, and since there is still so much to talk about, unfortunately, let us have a chat about the president. That is natural, because there are a several questions on the subject. Student Sergey Myshko asks the following: The title of one of your first interviews was "I Have Come Here To Fulfill the Will of the President." Is it feasible to suppose that whatever happens on television is then the result of the will of the president?

[Kravchenko] This question makes me smile, because the title of this article in the IZVESTIYA newspaper belongs to the category of sensational ones. The thing is that at the time when I was giving the intehrview to an IZVESTIYA journalist, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov phoned me to discuss one specific matter. And it was at that moment that I said that sentence. The journalist probably thought it very interesting, and he decided that it would describe precisely my role and my assignment here.

Several questions put to me here raise in plain terms the matter of who appointed me: Was it the president or somebody else? I am also asked whether I personally know the president. I sense that there is the implication in this question that the president dictates to Kravchenko on a daily basis, while Kravchenko exercises rigid control of the Gosteleradio. Let me assure you that this is not so.

Yes, we know each other personally. Yes, we keep in touch. Yes, there are telephone calls with recommendations and advice. But it is the same with the PRAVDA

newspaper, TASS, or the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, that has been reported more than once; there have been telephone calls conveying recommendations to the editorial board and the collective of this newspaper. This is normal. Moreover, it will be recalled that on numerous occasions Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev held meetings with journalists and leaders of the mass media. I think this practice will continue. And I can recall different times when a phone call received by a newspaper from the general secretary or the Supreme Soviet chairman would be an event lasting for years. So I think that ours is a modern democratic system of relations—not that of rigid control and regulation.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Our program is drawing to an end, and although it is finishing we still have some time left. I propose to hold a sort of a brief cross examination before the program ends.

When the program "Seven Days" existed it was presented by Aleksandr Tikhomirov. Well, now the program is not on the air, but we would like to know where Aleksandr Tikhomirov himself has disappeared—this question is from Viktor Telyatnikov from Dnepropetrovsk.

[Kravchenko] Aleksandr Tikhomirov himself is a deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He works in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and is on the air of the Russian Teleradio, of the RSFSR Teleradio company.

[Lomakin] Would Reshetov or Kravchenko agree to take part in a conversation televized live with the programs "Television News Service" and "Vzglyad"? Otherwise, some questions are left unanswered—this questions is from Bendershov, Moscow.

[Kravchenko] Has Petr Nikolayevich any objections?

[Reshetov] No.

[Kravchenko] Neither have I.

[Lomakin] Well, then it is now up to my colleagues. Here is a question from Vladimir Ilyich Penkin, Moscow: Why are the concluding remarks made by Gorbachev at various sessions transmitted on television and radio three times a day whereas Yeltsin's speech is summed up in two or three sentences only in the program "Vremya."

[Tupikin] We always relay speeches by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin on the radio.

[Kravchenko] As far as I remember, in all cases we have tried to show news conferences fully enough.

[Reshetov] I do not remember a single occasion when Yeltsin's speech ever failed to be shown on our television, in accordance with the requests expressed after he became Supreme Soviet chairman.

[Kravchenko] Incidentally, I can assure you for my part that regardless of the volume of broadcasting by the Russian television company, "Vremya" and the First Program in its social and political programs will invariably keep covering concrete, important state decisions at the level of Russia's Supreme Soviet and Government. The same applies to other republics.

[Lomakin] Today the newspaper KURANTY offers an account of Yeltsin's meeting with RSFSR people's deputies with RSFSR people's deputies who are workers. He said there that his statement or speech had already been recorded and scheduled for television transmission. This program has been set for 5 February, if I am not mistaken. Is this true? Will it really take place?

[Reshetov] Yes, indeed, it will be transmitted on the Second Program.

[Lomakin] Here is a question to Leonid Petrovich: You often speak about the social protection of people. But can there be any protection for the creative independence of television journalists? There is effectively no protection for journalists if they are removed from the air. Are you now trying to change this, or is this situation convenient for you at present, since it allows you to hold troublemakers at bay? This question is from Aleksey Petrovich Shakhov.

[Kravchenko] If the questioner is referring to the Gurnov case, the only incident when I was party to removing a journalist, what was at issue there was a plain administrative decision on his misconduct, a journalist's serious professional misconduct. As in that case, there are plain certain requirements in the profession of journalists, just like there are requirements in any creative process, and, in fact, any enterprise, I should say.

[Reshetov] This measure is practiced at all television companies of the world.

[Kravchenko] Incidentally, Sergey Dmitriyevich, you have gone through this experience yourself. Before one receives the right to work on the air, one has to go through a system of [word indistinct] admission. It has never had any political, but only strictly professional meaning. Because what is involved here is enormous trust. A person may work for 130 or 140 million people. He must have the highest sense of responsibility and the understanding that television has an enormous influence. This is what we must be guided by. If one's internal barriers break down and one ceases to understand one's supreme responsibility, then of course we are obliged to take appropriate measures.

[Lomakin] And here is the last question, it is not very pleasant. It is from Anatoliy Maksimovich Shustryy, Zhitomir oblast. Will Kravchenko, the Gosteleradio chairman, ever tender his resignation?

[Kravchenko] Of course, of course. I spoke about this when I was appointed, when I was introduced. After all, what we're talking about is the reform of Gosteleradio. There cannot be any conjecture about this. I am keen to resign. I am waiting for the time when the USSR Cabinet

of Ministers is finally formed and there will be a law on the Cabinet of Ministers, and no part of us will belong to the cabinet. Various organizations are adopting entire resolutions on this subject. For example, a plenum of democratic forces—held in Kharkov, I believe—adopted such a decision. I also regard myself as a democrat, by the way; but this term has led to endless confusion. I said: You are fighting for the same thing as me. But the question of the structure of the Cabinet of Ministers has not yet been settled. Consequently, the question of Gosteleradio has not been settled either. As I said, I would prefer not to be a minister. If I were to be entrusted with the position of head of a TV company, I would be happy to take it on.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Well, unfortunatley, our airtime is running out. Therefore, to conclude the program, I shall give each of you one-and-a-half minutes to talk about what you consider most important for our viewers to hear about, things that have not yet been mentioned in the program. I think that we will begin with Anatoliy Petrovich.

[Tupikin] Well, I am left with several questions sent by comrades. I would like to answer these very briefly. What does the radio think about Soviet patriotism? Why are there never any programs about this?

I don't think it is correct to say that there are none at all. But there are too few, and we will bear this in mind.

There is a very difficult question from Valentin Sergeyevich Fortunatov from Severodonetsk. According to the law in our country, the church is separate from the state. Why are religious programs broadcast on radio and TV? I don't wish to listen to such programs.

I agree that there may be a kind of vogue for such programs. At the same time I wish to say that the church occupies a large place in our life, and the more important events in the activities of the church should probably be covered on the radio also. However, this is a very complex question, because there are different denominations and they have to have equal or proportional representation. Clearly this should depend on the different regions. In conclusion I would like to say that All-Union radio will continue to follow the guidelines I endeavored to explain at the beginning. We will try to make our programs as interesting as possible, as responsive as possible to our people's needs.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Anatoliy Petrovich. Over to you Petr Nikolayevich. Keep it short please.

[Reshetov] Yes. In this program we have mainly dealt with negative questions, criticism of our television service. Somehow, I feel we have overlooked one thing. As you mentioned at the beginning, we have over 3,500 production staff alone working for us in television. We have about 10,000 technicians—even more in fact. In general, a very good creative collective has developed in our television service. In addition to the negative features we have discussed here, the problems with "Vzglyad" and "TNS"—criticisms were expressed there, and so on—I have to say that interesting new programs have emerged. We have new and interesting presenters, new and interesting people, announcers, and so on. right now I could mention dozens of names of people whom the ratings place among the most popular presenters, popular organizers of various programs. It is not only the "Vremya" program that viewers watch with great interest. They not only express their criticism of TNS, which they want to be a good and pleasing program. But there have also been many delighted reactions from viewers to the "Word" program, that is winning increasing popularity among viewers. And this applies to many other programs.

At the last staff meeting we held—these are usually attended by most of our production staff in television—a concern was expressed, one that is very typical for most people who work in television today.

[Lomakin] Petr Nikolayevich, please.

[Reshetov] Don't worry, I am now finishing. Their concern is to maintain our television service, through the efforts of each member of its staff, as a source of all that is most moral, most humane, most cherished; to help people through this complex obstacle course, this self-destructive situation, to help them remain people, to remain individuals.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Leonid Petrovich?

[Kravchenko] My dream is that this program—and, certainly, other programs we will be presenting to viewers—should help to build confidence and civic accord; that television should enjoy the confidence of the people; and that we, for our part, should do our utmost to achieve this.

[Lomakin] Thank you. Thank you. Well, on that note we are ending our program. Unfortunately our speakers were unable to answer all your questions. That is quite understandable. It is very difficult to answer them in the time allotted. But we will pass all your questions on to our center for study of public opinion. I hope that they will be analyzed and then passed on to the leadership of the USSR Gosteleradio, so that it can familiarize itself with all the questions. It is hard for me to say whether you are satisfied with the answers to these questions. But I am convinced of one thing: I am convinced that they were completely sincere and frank.

I would like to say a few more words before bidding farwell. With this program Central Television is starting a series of regular live programs in which the leadership of the USSR Gosteleradio will be answering questions from viewers, your questions. We hope these programs will go out once every two months. I think we will try to ensure that this rhythm is maintained. Thank you for your attention. All the best. Good night.

Economic

Stankevich Denies Moscow Price Rise Decision

LD3001150691 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1438 GMT 30 Jan 91

[Text] At a sitting today of the second session of the Moscow soviet, Sergey Stankevich, first deputy chairman of the Moscow soviet made a statement refuting the assertion by Senchagov, chairman of the USSR Goskomtsen [State Committee for Prices], published in the Moscow evening edition of the newspaper IZVESTIYA on 29 January. The statement says that neither the Moscow city soviet of people's deputies nor the Presidium of the Moscow soviet, not the Soviet's Executive Committee have adopted any decisions whatsoever on price rises. The assertion contained in the IZVESTIYA article that this was done by the Moscow soviet, in accordance with the program passed by it for the transition to contractual prices, does not correspond to reality. Thus, Senchagov's information is, evidently, based on unchecked reports, Sergey Stankevich stressed.

Bank Note Deferred Procedure Outlined

PM0402114991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by Gennadiy Yastrebtsov: "Second Wave. Concerning the Money That Will Return to Us Following Operation 'Exchange'"]

[Text] Readers in various republics, oblasts, cities, and villages have been calling, wiring, or writing to the editorial office. What bothers them all is how operation "Exchange," which started on 23 January, is going to end. Will one have to stand in line again for hours to be reimbursed? We asked A.V. Voylukov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Bank board for an explanation. Here is what he said:

"Indeed, there was a good deal of confusion, particularly on the first day of the exchange. I will not talk about the reasons—much has already been written in the newspapers and there have been explanations on radio and television. To avoid another hullabaloo and long lines of people waiting for money to be returned, we have adopted certain measures.

"I would remind you that on 27 January the country's banks almost completed the acceptance of 1961-style 50- and 100-ruble notes for exchange. As of 28 January the notes are accepted for exchange on the basis of decisions by local soviet executive committees' deputies' commissions only from citizens for whom an extension of the exchange period has been authorized by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution. That means people who, for example, have been abroad on business, on long voyages, or out in distant pastures...

"Now for the way the money will be issued. Again it is the rayon and city soviet executive committees' deputies' commissions that decide. The money will be issued on receipt of the records of the commissions' where the bank notes were surrendered, as envisaged by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution, published in the press. That is, all money and all savings from earned income will be returned to their rightful owners. In they wish, they can receive the sum indicated in the resolution in cash. However, in our experts' opinion, the majority of the money that is being exchanged, is hardly likely to be required for immediate expenditure. Therefore, to avoid a second wave of lines and unnecessary fuss, the USSR State Bank has proposed that citizens voluntarily, I stress, voluntarily decide to deposit it in the Savings Bank. This is not only more convenient, but more profitable as well: You get interest on deposits and, what is more, you do not have to worry about keeping the cash safe and sound.

"How will it all be organized in practice? All you have to do is make a declaration at your place of work or, in the case of pensioners, to the Savings Bank, of the number of the account to which the amount due is to be credited. If the depositor decides to remove money from his account, he will face no obstacles—Savings Bank institutions have been instructed that the exchange money transferred to deposit accounts will be issued freely to the depositors. What is particularly important is that there is no limit on the amount and there is no need for an identity card entry, now required for other cash payments.

"As for the idle talk and gossip, that has suddenly spread, to the effect that 25-ruble notes are soon to be withdrawn from circulation, I will state officially that there is no real foundation for these rumors."

Cabinet Debates Exchange

PM0502103991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by I. Zhagel: "Money Exchange: Plus 8 Billion—Minus 80 Million"]

[Text] A routine session of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on 30 January examined the preliminary results of the exchange of 50-ruble and 100-ruble bank notes and outlined further measures making it possible to complete with the greatest success the initiated campaign. V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank], gave information on this question.

Noting that the final figures for the exchange will most likely be ready by 7 February, V. Gerashchenko named figures that in general have already been mentioned in our newspaper: As of 1 January 1991 there were approximately 48,199 million rubles [R] in circulation in notes of R50 and R100. As of the end of the day of 25 January about R40 billion had been handed into the cash offices. Thus as a result of the exchange campaign we have

managed to "syphon off" R8 billion of the money previously in the possession of representatives of the shadow economy.

In addition many organizations had handed in to the banks on 23 January—that is on the first day of the exchange—far larger sums than they did usually. A particularly large number of such cases was noted among trade enterprises, both state and cooperative.

Specific facts were also cited. For instance, "Tashkomisintorg" handed in to the bank about R900,000 under the guise of the cash office cash in hand [ostatok], set for it at just R1,000. The same happened in Moldavia with the commission stores association. And even the Park of Culture and Leisure, where the proceeds are extremely small, contrived to hand in a cash office cash in hand of R21,000.

The executive committee commissions must now carefully examine all such cases so that money handed in illegally is not returned to its owners. This work is extremely painstaking so the Cabinet of Ministers has decided to extend the deadline for its examination of the legality of the sums handed in from enterprises and to involve the relevant law enforcement organs in this. According to V. Gerashchenko—and he stressed that his assessment is "conservative"—painstaking analysis will make it possible to retain a further R3-5 billion.

Among the questions put at the session to the chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank was the following: Has the campaign to exchange large-denomination notes made it possible to determine what sums of paper money were abroad and what quantity has been successfully neutralized, so to speak?

In all, V. Gerashchenko explained, customs officials confiscated about R500,000 at the border. This confirms once again the assessments of USSR Gosbank specialists, who believed that not that much paper money had been taken out of the country. It is true that there is confusion here—it is not bank notes but securities that are exported to the West. But the securities are illegal and most of them will be confiscated when they are discovered.

Despite this explanation, at the Cabinet of Ministers session the opinion was nonetheless voiced that the small sums withheld at the border perhaps attest that money has been channeled abroad. But to state this confidently additional research is needed.

As for the cost of the exchange campaign, the following figures were cited: R70-80 million. That is not counting the nervous strain and upheaval experienced by many people.

In conclusion Prime Minister V. Pavlov stressed that the campaign to exchange large-denomination notes should in no case be called a money reform. And as for the results of the exchange, in his opinion we must have in mind not only the direct confiscation of funds from dealers in the shadow economy but also the detection of numerous channels conducting illegal operations.

And one cannot fail to mention one more thing. The report delivered by the chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is in general an absurdity. After all, the recently adopted law "on the USSR State Bank" states clearly that it is subordinate to the country's parliament and independent of executive and management organs. It guarantees the consolidation of our monetary unit and the stability of the entire financial system. But, as we can see, the central bank's dependence on the government remains.

Distribution of Imported Goods Hampered

PM0402151791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0330 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Report from the "120 + 30 Utro" program]

[Text] [Reporter] It seems that the influx of goods arriving under barter deals is swamping our enterprises to such an extent that they will not be able to cope with them. But at any rate, what you are seeing is not a question of "Severgazprom"—one of Europe's largest enterprises—keeping goods away from the customer. Although you will agree that, given the empty shelves in our stores, it is shocking. What's more, the central authorities keep the enterprise in the dark about the retail prices for goods obtained in exchange for certain Russian raw materials. Overseas businessmen who are used to success view this disorder as an amazing shortcoming.

[Unidentified man] One of the reasons is the lack of sufficient storage facilities. We didn't expect to get this amount of goods. The lack of motor transport is also one of the main reasons. And another reason is that the goods are distributed to "Severgazprom" subunits.

[Reporter] I hope these figures won't frighten you—289 tonnes of beef, 96 tonnes of pork, 705,000 standard cans of food, and 40 tonnes of fish have not yet been sold by the association. Contracts worth 80 million rubles have been concluded for the delivery of imported industrial goods. All these things can be bought by workers in the gas sector. Yet those who are servicing them—and who are unable to sell any of the goods received under barter deals—are not receiving any income for the time being. These are the ins and outs of our new economy.

Turkmen KGB Battles Economic Crime

914D0132A Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 28 Dec 90 p 2

[Article by V. Obramenko: "An Obstacle to Economic Sabotage"]

[Text] **The supplies of an increasing number of goods and foodstuffs are now running short, despite enterprises being in operation, turning out products, and shipping**

them to retail establishments. A good crop was grown in the fields and fruit and vegetable gardens. However, where is all of this, why is it not reaching consumers? Where has everything gone, and where has it gotten stuck?

Members of headquarters for combating economic sabotage that have been created and have begun operations in our country and in the republic should answer these and many other questions. The headquarters include employees of the Committee of State Control, law-enforcement organs, the Procuracy, and the Committee for State Security. Chief of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB Economic Department and member of the republic headquarters for combating economic sabotage S. Seidov discussed the results of the initial days of struggle to put trade and storage facilities in order and prevent the massive withholding of goods from consumers at a meeting with journalists.

This new function for officers of state security was introduced after decrees were issued by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Turkmen SSR President S.A. Niyazov strengthening the control of the supply of foodstuffs and consumer goods to the populace, as well as a resolution of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet dated 23 November of this year.

In the first two weeks of our joint work with employees of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the Procuracy, and State Control, large amounts of secreted foodstuffs worth almost 3 million rubles [R] and nonfood manufactured goods worth more than R3.5 million have been found. They were kept in the stock rooms of shops, at warehouses and storage facilities, and at times on altogether unsuitable premises. Of course, this massive concealment of goods at a time when the shelves of stores were empty may be called sabotage, that is, failure to perform one's duties, disobeying the law, and destabilizing trade and the economy. Naturally, this troubles the people who demand that resolute measures be taken to restore order.

Thus, an acute shortage of cheese in our stores notwithstanding, 251 half-cindered cheese rounds weighing five kilograms each were found in the steppe in the vicinity of Kum-Dag. The person who destroyed this high caloric product, of which there is not enough even for children, must have been very avaricious and soulless. At present, a criminal case has been initiated in conjunction with this criminal fact, and an investigation is in progress. How can we remain indifferent, given the fact that in the Chardzhou Oblast Union of Consumer Cooperatives consumer goods worth almost R2.5 million were found that were kept beyond their expiration dates? There were toys for children alone worth more than R1 million, despite the fact that shelves in toy departments have been bare lately. Cruel adults have robbed many of our children of joy. Investigative organs will have to determine why this is being done...

A great variety of goods were kept back and not shipped from the storage facilities. Goods in short supply worth R500,000 that were kept at the Chardzhou Household Goods Storage Facility were found during inspections. At the Employee Supply Department [ORS] of the Mary Administration for Drilling Operations, canned goods worth almost R580,000 and R760,000-worth of imported sausage were found. Ten tons of sausage products and more than seven tons of meat were found at the ORS of the Shatlykgazstroy Administration.

A list of such violations may be continued.

To be sure, it may seem to many people that our participation in this endeavor supplants the actions of other law-enforcement organs. There is no supplanting. We merely provide assistance with combating the concealment of goods and discovering their unlawful storage. It is up to the MVD and the Procuracy to investigate, prepare criminal cases, and punish. After all, in the last 30 years there has been no notion of "economic sabotage" in the legislation of our country.

Speculators, pilferers of people's wealth, and shadow-economy operators are well aware of this when they place obstacles in our path and at times prevent us from entering warehouses, storage facilities, and so on. The decrees of the USSR and Turkmen SSR presidents and resolutions of the USSR Supreme Soviet open a door to such inspections for us. However, "warehouses" are being set up in the houses of trade personnel, their relatives, and workers of shops and warehouses. We are aware of them. However, law-enforcement organs are virtually powerless until criminal charges are filed against "owners."

Of course, our legislation is far from perfect. At present, we must adopt laws on state security and the USSR Committee for State Security, work now is proceeding full speed. In the immediate future, they should be submitted for adoption to the legislators of our country. Legality is also needed in many functions that are not characteristic of the KGB; in the absence of this, it will be difficult for the KGB in the future to perform the duties it has been entrusted with.

At the end of the meeting, S. Seidov responded to numerous questions by correspondents, including this one: "Will your participation be another temporary campaign, with speculators, pilferers, and those who take part in withholding goods from the people then will feel safe?"

S. Seidov said: "We cannot promise them a quiet life, at any rate until the situation in the republic and the country stabilizes and also as long as the decrees of the USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Turkmen SSR President S.A. Niyazov and the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution apply."

Scientific

Soyuz-7-Cosmos 1686 Changes Trajectory

LD0102173591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Feb 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Following trajectory changes made today at 1500 [1200 GMT], the maximum height of the Soyuz 7-Cosmos 1686 complex is 228 kilometers; the minimum height is 218 kilometers. It is expected that the complex will enter the dense layers of the atmosphere in the period 6 - 8 February this year.

Spokesman Gives Details on Space Station Demise

LD0102190791 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 1 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—The Soviet Salyut-7/Cosmos- 1686 space station is expected to cease to exist between February 6- 7, Soviet anti-aircraft defence spokesman Mikhail Shpitalnik told a news conference today.

Shpitalnik noted that Soviet anti-aircraft defence troops were constantly monitoring the flight of the station, and the more exact time for it to cease existence will be announced three days before the moment.

In spite of the station's total weight of some 40 tonnes, only the descent capsule of the Cosmos-1686 satellite could pose some danger of coming down and hitting the earth's surface, he said.

The weight of the capsule reaching the earth will depend on the level of its burning up in the atmosphere and could amount to 1.26 to two tonnes. The most probably site of the crash will be forecast some 24 hours before the station ceases to exist, Shpitalnik said.

Soviet Deputy General Machine-Building Minister Yuriy Koptev noted that all interested countries are constantly receiving information about the flight of the station and forecasts of its possible "behaviour".

More on Salyut-7

PM0402171191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by special correspondent A. Tarasov: "It Is Twisting and Turning and Wants To Come Down... Salyut-7 Nears the End"]

[Text] As of today, Monday, the Flight Control Center task force tracking the descent of the 40-tonne Salyut-7-Cosmos-1686 communications station is on round-the-clock duty. The space ballistics experts, mathematicians, and controllers, backed up by air defense "eyes" and metering systems, must not get their forecast wrong.

At the end of last week Yu. Koptev, chairman of the task force set up by decision of the government and deputy minister of general machine building, carried out a review of available manpower and resources in the Flight Control Center's blue conference hall.

M. Shpitalnik, representative of the Air Defense Forces, recalled that the radar systems monitoring outer space routinely track the almost 7,000 objects travelling over USSR territory today. Salyut-7 is one of them and has been monitored from the very day of its launch, 19 April 1982. As of 1 February the altitude of its orbit was 230.4-214.7 km at apogee and perigee. Its rate of descent was 4-6 km per day. According to the calculations carried out that day the possible date of the "termination of the craft's existence" is the latter half of 6 February through 7 February. The state of the upper layers of the atmosphere could influence the date in one direction or the other.

"We will give a date with greater probability three days ahead of the time, and it will be possible to talk about the actual orbit 24 hours ahead of the time..."

Prof. V. Pokuchayev, leader of the Flight Control Center ballistics service, also complained that the upper layers of the atmosphere are capricious and made precise calculation difficult. Their density and consequently their braking force are impossible to predict "from a distance." Hence the elasticity of the long-term forecast, including 8 February.

Can the 50-70 kg of fuel left in the station's tanks help? Everything will become clear if you bear in mind that at least 500 kg are needed for a real boost. Nevertheless, cosmonaut Vladimir Solovyev, the flight director, considers that even these dregs could be used. If not for a short boost, then at least to tilt the communication satellite to help it use its "sail" to undershoot or overshoot an undesirable spot. "The motor can be engaged only once, at the requisite moment, when you are absolutely certain that you are going to improve rather than worsen the situation."

Then V. Pallo, the chief expert on the future debris, deputy chief designer of the "Salyut" Design Bureau, which created the two vehicles, spoke. His chart showed up to 250 fragments capable of surviving the heat of atmospheric friction and reaching the earth's surface. The smallest items will be nuts and bolts, the largest the Cosmos-1686 reentry vehicle. It will weigh 1,260-2,045 kg, depending on burnup. He assured people that the solid-fuel motors for a soft landing are "empty," as its reentry was not envisaged. Meanwhile there will be "fragments" of the propulsion unit, turbopump units,

combustion chambers, blast deflectors, spherical tanks, and other heat-resistant components.

The huge area these handfuls of fragments will fall is comforting. The area will depend upon the altitude of destruction: If it starts at 100 km, distribution will be over 9,000 square km; if at 80 km, over "only" 4,000 square km... But, just in case, we have already started looking at the Convention on International Responsibility for Damage Caused by Space Objects, adopted 29 March 1972. What has it in store for us this time?

'Salyut-7' Return to Earth Reviewed

PM0502094991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2

[Article by S. Leskov: "'Salyut-7': Do Not Expect A Soft Landing"]

[Text] The "Salyut-7" orbital complex is getting closer and closer to the earth's surface. The speed of its uncontrolled descent is increasing, and there are just 190 km left before it reaches the earth.

This year IZVESTIYA has twice (Nos. 6 and 15) discussed the dramatic events surrounding the "Salyut-7" orbital complex. According to latest forecasts—if these are not disrupted by unforeseen atmospheric storms—"Salyut-7" can be expected to fall to earth sometime during the second half of 6 February or on 7 February. It will only be possible to calculate the landing site a few orbits before the event.

The seriousness of the problem is shown by the fact that an operational group under the leadership of Yu. Koptev, USSR deputy minister of general machine building, has been set up to determine an action plan for the final phase of the orbital station's flight and to eliminate the consequences of its landing—if, of course, there are any. The operational group began work 1 February, it unites specialists from the Defense and Foreign Ministries, the scientific and design organizations involved in developing and operating the complex, and representatives from the State Commission for Emergencies.

The preliminary estimate is that around 250 fragments will reach the earth's surface. Rain induced by space debris will cover an area 4,000-9,000 km long and 80-105 km wide. The velocity of the descent will reach 150 meters per second. But these fragments will not be large. The greatest danger will be posed by the "Kosmos-1686" descent module which is docked with "Salyut-7." This impressive sphere 3 meters in diameter weighs 2.5 tonnes.

Yu. Koptev reported that, following requests from abroad, the Soviet side has given NASA, the European Space Agency, and the Italian and Japanese national space agencies all the data relating to the trajectory and characteristics of "Salyut-7." A proposal was made for the orbit to be jointly monitored [kontrol], but no reply has yet been received. Under international regulations all countries on whose territory fragments could land will be officially informed 24 hours before the landing. Is the danger great? One would imagine that we could fall back on statistics. After all, every year fragments of dozens of spacecraft fall to earth, but they have never yet caused any direct damage. That may be so, but in 1979, after fragments of the Soviet nuclear-powered "Kosmos-954" landed in Canada, we had to pay out more than $10 million to cover the cost of remedying the environmental consequences of the incident. Any number of unexpected things could happen. It is not surprising that, when the "Skylab" space station was in an uncontrolled descent about 10 years ago, the Americans took the precaution of organizing a prestigious group of lawyers to assess the validity of any possible claims against the United States. But one would hope that this time things will not reach the point where the competence of our lawyers has to be tested.

If the landing is expected to occur on our territory, the operational group should quickly inform local soviets, civil defense headquarters, and regional emergency committees about the danger. It should be borne in mind that the specific orbit on which the landing will happen will only be known six hours before the event. And the landing area will be known even later. USSR Defense Ministry search and rescue services and specially equipped air-defense services will be involved in this work.

The station's orbit will be monitored from data provided by operational on-board systems, as well as with the help of air-defense radars. Unfortunately, despite the fact that many of the station's systems are in working order, its descent is uncontrollable because there is virtually no fuel left in its integrated fuel tanks. It would take around 500 kg of fuel to shift 40 tonnes in the necessary direction out of its orbit, but no more than 70 kg is available [natsedit]. But it has been decided not to miss even a small chance of influencing the trajectory. A few drops of fuel could be enough at best to turn the station in the necessary direction, thereby altering drag. Admittedly we need above all to make sure that the "Salyut-7" attitude control system, which has not been engaged for two years, is still operational. If it is working normally, then Mission Control's ballistics specialists will attempt a task that has not yet been achieved in space history: to spin a falling station and land it in an unpopulated area.

This crisis situation is quite typical; it arose as a result of an explosive synthesis of negligence and unconsidered, hidden external factors. It had been planned to land "Kosmos-1686" in a safe area. But now, apart from the risk of the actual landing, is there any guarantee that there are no dangerous elements aboard the descent module? This is by no means an idle question. After all, when fully loaded, the descent module in the craft series "Kosmos-1686" belongs contained two cesium instruments, several powder engines, and heptyl fuel, more dangerous than mustard gas in terms of its effect on humans. And there was that unfortunate incident around

10 years ago when a similar craft landed in Kazakhstan. The machine operators who were first to reach it decided to help themselves to certain parts, intending to use them to stun fish. As a result they were severely burned and it was only by a miracle that their sight was saved.

But this time, General Designer G. Yefremov guarantees, a landing phase was not envisaged from the outset and so the descent module is equipped with absolutely nothing that could pose a danger to over-curious collectors of space debris. But, as is well known, God helps those who help themselves. Since there is no prize on offer from the space department for finding the remnants of the orbital station, it is better to keep as far away from it as possible.

Space Debris Contaminates Kazakh Pastures

PM0402113591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 91 First Edition p 8

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent V. Ryzhkov under "Tickertape" rubric: "Payment for 'Rain'"]

[Text] Metal falls from the skies in these parts, and the pastures of many farms in Dzhezkazgan Oblast are littered with space "refuse." In attempts to maintain secrecy the spent stages of booster rockets were for many years blown up here and the fragments scattered over the fields, contaminating the land with toxic substances. But who at that time could make military departments pay damages?

A year ago there were finally signs of progress. Representatives of Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology] went to Dzhezkazgan. They gave their word that they would restrict the areas where the "metal" falls from the sky, alter the method of blowing up the stages, and clear pastures of the fragments. A special subunit was even organized for these purposes.

The set date has passed. But the major department has not entirely kept its word. Only 8,000 tonnes of space "refuse" have been collected in the intervening period. At this rate the "harvest" will drag on for many years. So Glavkosmos is being sued for 1.7 million rubles. Only will it be able to pay?

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Meets With Lithuanian Party Leader

LD0502155691 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 5 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today received representatives of the Lithuanian Democratic Workers' Party (LDWP) headed by its leader Algirdas Brazauskas.

Press secretary of the Lithuanian mission in Moscow Lenginas Vasiliauskas told TASS that Brazauskas declined to meet Moscow reporters, promising to hold a news conference in Vilnius.

At the meeting which lasted about 90 minutes, the sides discussed the occupation of buildings in Vilnius by troops, including buildings owned by the former Lithuanian Communist Party, Vasiliauskas said.

According to the press secretary, Gorbachev promised to instruct the business administration of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Soviet Government to settle this issue as soon as possible.

Vasiliauskas said "The president reiterated at the meeting that he had nothing to do with the tragic events in Vilnius in January. Gorbachev emphasised the need to find and punish the guilty. [no closing quotation mark as received]

Brazauskas, who was vice-premier in the Kazimiera Prunskiene government that recently resigned, earlier headed the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party until it was renamed the Democratic Workers' Party last December.

Party Official Recounts Meeting

LD0502155291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1430 GMT 5 Feb 91

[Text] Algirdas Brazauskas chairman of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party, Vladimiras Beriozovas, secretary of that party, and Domijonas Sniukas, editor-in-chief of the newspaper TIESA visited Moscow today. They met with Soviet President Gorbachev.

After this meeting our correspondent Kazys Vlius talked to V. Beriozovas on the telephone.

[Begin recording] [Valius] This is Radio of Independent Lithuania. Comrade Beriozovas, did all of you meet with Gorbachev?

[Beriozovas] Yes.

[Valius] Who was in our delegation?

[Beriozovas] Brazauskas, I, and Sniukas.

[Valius] How long did the reception last?

[Beriozovas] Almost an hour and a half.

[Valius] What was discussed?

[Beriozovas] The main topic was the Publishing House, that it should be returned in the condition in which it was on 7 January. Then we spoke about party property in general, saying that the other side was taking everything over. And then we appealed to him as president asking him to resolve the issue of the television committee and the television tower.

[Valius] And what were the results?

[Beriozovas] He promised to deal with the solution of these issues, saying that he will send an influential commission concerning the Publishing House. He also mentioned the name of the person whom he allegedly will entrust with the task, and we wanted to get in contact with this peson. We are phoning him but we have not managed to find him yet. That was to speed up the solution of these issues.

Concerning the television and the television tower he said that orders would be given by him along government channels on this matter. [passage omitted]

[Valius] Who is Gorbachev's man?

[Beriozovas] Concerning the Publishing House this will be somebody in the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee—one of those people who are dealing with the party's economic affairs. Perhaps these people will be of a higher rank, however. He said that these would be people who would be authorized to solve these questions on the spot.

[Valius] And concerning other buildings? Will the same person resolve these issues?

[Beriozovas] [Words indistinct] It sounds like there will be another commission. Concerning the CPSU organization we raised the question concerning all the buildings, saying that all buildings were occupied and that we virtually have nothing in Vilnius except the building in B. Radvilaite Street. Everything has been taken away.

[Valius] Do you think everything will be solved in a positive way?

[Beriozovas] If thanks to such talks everything could be resolved 100 percent it would be very good indeed. However, this is a step and I think that as a result there will be some progress. Once again we became convinced that he had no genuine information about Lithuania. [end recording]

Plebiscite on Lithuania's Future Begins

LD0402150391 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius February 4 TASS—A plebiscite on the future of Lithuania virtually began throughout the republic today.

Polling is being conducted by a decision of the Lithuanian parliament. Citizens of the republic and those residents who under the provisions of Lithuania's current Law on Citizenship have the right to be Lithuanian citizens may participate in the plebiscite.

The conduct of the polling has been entrusted to the republican electoral commission, city and district self-governing authorities, city and district electoral commissions.

The republican electoral commission slated February 9 as the polling day. However, by a decision of the republican electoral commission, those who for this or that reason will not be able to go to the polls on February 9 have the right, beginning from today, to get a polling paper at the polling station and answer the question "Are you for the Lithuanian state to be an independent democratic republic?"

Upon putting one's signature in the voter register and crossing out "yes" or "no" in the polling paper, a respondent puts it in an envelope which is sealed in his presence and stamped by the electoral commission's seal. On the polling day, the envelope is then put into a ballot-box in the presence of the electoral commission members.

The republican parliament and government believe that the decision by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to hold a referendum on March 17, this year, on the future of the union "does not concern Lithuania".

Active work has been launched in the republic to secure that as wide sections of the population as possible take part in the polling which republican President Vytautas Landsbergis laterly refers to as a "plebiscite on the future of the Lithuanian state".

An address signed by representatives of 19 political parties and public organizations has been made public. They call on the population to "declare for an independent Lithuania".

At the same time, representatives of the Lithuanian Civil Committee which comes out in defence of the rights of USSR citizens in the republic, have called on their supporters not to participate in the plebiscite.

The Lithuanian media report that the polling in Lithuania will be monitored by foreign representatives, specifically by parliamentary delegations from the Nordic Council and a number of Western countries.

Gorbachev Decrees Poll Invalid

LD0502142991 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1340 GMT 5 Feb 91

["Text" of the USSR president's decree on the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet decisions of 16 and 18 January 1991 to poll Lithuanian residents on the future of Lithuania]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet, in implementing the decisions of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and proceeding from the premise that no one apart from the people themselves can assume the historic responsibility for the fate of the USSR, and in accordance with the legislation on a referendum in the USSR, adopted a resolution on 16 January 1991 on organizing and taking measures to provide for the holding of a USSR referendum on the question of the preservation of the USSR.

The same day, the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet issued a resolution on polling the inhabitants of the Lithuanian republic, clarifying its decision of 18 January of this year.

The above resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR cannot be assessed otherwise than as intended to block the implementation in the republic of the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet on holding a USSR referendum on the question of the preservation of the USSR.

Taking advantage of the aggravated sociopolitical situation in the republic, its leaders are trying, with the help of a poll, to organize support for their separatist ambitions. Taking into account the above, on the basis of Paragraph 1, Article 127, subparagraph 3 of the USSR Constitution, I resolve:

1. To declare that the poll being held in accordance with the resolutions of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR of 16 January 1991 and of 18 January of the same year and the attempts to declare it a plebiscite on the future of the Lithuanian state are juridically invalid.

2. The supreme and local bodies of state power and administration of the Lithuanian SSR and the relevant ministries and departments of the USSR are to ensure strict fulfillment on the republic's territory of the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 16 January of this year on the organization and measures to ensure the holding of the USSR referendum on the question of the preservation of the USSR and also the legislation of the USSR referendum and the guarantees thereby envisaged for the free expression of the will of all citizens in the holding of the referendum.

We have aquainted you with the text of the decree of the USSR president on the decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR of 16 and 18 January of this year on the holding of a poll of the inhabitants of the republic.

Council Issues Appeal on Plebiscite

LD0502063991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Appeal of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council to the people of Lithuania; date not given]

[Text] The victims of 13 January, the bloody Sunday, have already said yes to an independent Lithuania. Can we not confirm this decision on 9 February? The opponents of our independence urge us not to take part in the poll. Remember, they will explain that all those who failed to come to vote are against the independence of Lithuania.

With the 21st century coming nearer, we are firmly aspiring to set up a state of Lithuania as a democratic republic in which the might of the authorities comes from the strength of the people of Lithuania. Only freely elected representatives have the right to implement it. Nobody else has the right to usurp this authority.

Let 9 February be the day of the declaration of the will of all the people of Lithuania—Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, and other nationalities declaring this fact of special importance to oneself, to Lithuania, and to the world."

Wording of Plebiscite Questioned

LD0402174291 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS—Prominent Soviet sociologist Yuri Te believes the Lithuanian parliament may have loaded the dice in the plebiscite.

"The wording of the question asked in the plebiscite in Lithuania, involuntarily reveals its authors' wish to receive the answer 'yes', as there is hardly a person who would not wish to live in an independent democratic republic, preferring it to a dependent and undemocratic one," Te told TASS.

"From the point of view of sociological methods there is no fault in such a wording, as there are two possible answers 'yes' or 'no'," Te said.

"But the purpose of the referendum must be known in order to assess the wording," he said. "I believe the results of the plebiscite could be used to justify Lithuania's secession from the Soviet Union."

"If the majority of those polled answer 'yes', there would be a temptation to interpret it as a mandate for independence, although the issue of the republic's secession from the Soviet Union is not included in the question," Te said.

He believes the results may be given too great an importance. "It is necessary to study public opinion, but a sociological poll cannot replace economic and political decisions and break historic ties," Te said.

Committee Sees Poll as 'Swindle'

PM0402202691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Captain 2d Rank V. Gromak: "Another Political Swindle?"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet has approved the ballot for a general poll of the inhabitants to take place on 9 February. The ballot contains this question: "Are you in favor of the Lithuanian state being an independent democratic republic?" Beneath the question are the words "Yes" and "No." Ballots will be considered invalid if neither of these words has been struck out, or if both have.

In connection with the forthcoming general poll the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Citizens' Committee has appealed to members of political parties, democratic organizations, and movements, and to all people of Lithuania. The appeal says, in particular: "Is it moral to submit to an unlawful poll a provision from a Constitution that does not exist, that is still only being drafted? The formula on the ballot also indicates a deliberate political swindle... Who is going to vote against an independent democratic republic? Nobody? That is the secret of the deception. Because there can be different kinds of independent democratic republics—presidential, parliamentarian, people's, soviet, and so forth. All kinds of political regimes could establish themselves there, even a terrorist regime.

"By keeping quiet about the nature of power in a future democratic republic, V. Landsbergis' group is keeping its hands free: After receiving approval for the formula, it will be able to establish a political regime to its own liking..."

The Lithuanian SSR Citizens' Committee called on fellow citizens not to go to the polls 9 February.

Lithuanians Divided on Poll

PM0102134791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Yu. Stroganov under general headline: "Reports from the Baltic Area"]

[Text] Vilnius—Many people in Lithuania describe as wooing the malcontents the legislature's decision that the native language can be used on a par with the state language in places that are heavily populated by "foreign-language speakers." There have also been reports of likely concessions to those demanding Polish autonomy. Politicians link these decisions to the upcoming poll of the republic's inhabitants on whether Lithuania should be an independent democratic republic. What is more, the appeal by M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the

Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, to the republic leadership was described by G. Vagnoryus, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, as a maneuver.

So do we have a war of nerves instead of real accord? Meanwhile, the day of the poll of the republic's population is drawing near. It is to make its difficult choice on 9 February. But the choice is difficult only for those who are convinced of the need for the republic to develop as part of a renewed federation. Many people have been telling me of their doubts.

"I cannot vote against the republic's independence, against democracy," one active supporter of Lithuania's socialist development said. "But I also realize that the results of the vote will be used in the struggle for the republic's secession from the USSR. People will probably try to substitute this poll for the referendum in which the idea of the existence of a renewed federation is clearly formulated.

This idea was expressed by many people. Indeed, who could fail to be worried about it? After all, the question of Lithuania's attitude toward the USSR remains unclear. The opponents of the republic's membership of it will say: "The people voted for its independence." The supporters of the Union will object: "Cannot an independent Lithuania sign the Union treaty? After all, independence does not contradict the concept of a union of sovereign states."

Lithuanian Supreme Council Session 4 Feb

LD0402131891

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 0815 GMT on 4 February begins carrying a live relay of a plenary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius. The session is chaired by Deputy Aleksandras Abisala.

At 0819 GMT, Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis begins delivering a report on the situation in Lithuania.

Landsbergis begins by noting that the situation had been relatively calm over the past weekend, that incidents continue all the time but that no tragedies had ensued. He notes that the attack that culminated in the events of 12-13 January had begun even before 11 March 1990.

"Undoubtedly," Landsbergis says, "We were also aware that attempts would be made to create disturbances in Lithuania through some means, and to create the impression that the population is divided." He notes that this Moscow-devised scenario was implemented and military force was used to bring about bloodshed.

He goes on to point out that the USSR has been badly compromised by the events in Lithuania. He observes that this is the probable reason for the present abstinence from those methods. He mentions the presence of "military pressure and a certain type of terror, since, we do not know whether some people may or may not be apprehended on the streets, arrested, or beaten with rifle butts. Even if these were only isolated incidents, they perpetrate a situation of spiritual pressure. By this means, the fact is demonstrated that here is a power which is greater than the law and that power is such that we are unable to oppose."

Landsbergis points out that those who rely solely on this type of power and emphasize the fact that they cannot be opposed here, may not be able to perceive the presence of another force, that is a "force of one's convictions, which has been demonstrated by the people of Lithuania, and that is no less forceful a weapon—a mighty weapon in peaceful self-defense."

He notes that after all these modes of attack, the tendency now is to slide back toward the "political end of the spectrum." He notes that current propaganda is directed very clearly at this.

He continues: "Efforts are under way to create within the Western countries an impression that the Soviet Army is being withdrawn from Lithuania, that the airborne units have been sent away. Those individuals who are inexperienced think that this is indeed so. Moreover, other units are brought in to replace them and no one is really checking or counting to ascertain whether they had really been decreased, by at least one soldier."

Landsbergis goes on to cite instances where units change their attire to hide their true identity, or are maintained in more concealed circumstances, on their bases, only five minutes distance from the center of Vilnius. He adds: "We are aware, however, that form a distance things appear different than they are." He points out that the "true indicator of the situation" which provides a fair appraisal of whether the Army is being withdrawn, lies in the military control posts, patrols and presence in the occupied buildings. He adds: "There is nothing for them to do there." He emphasizes that until the soldiers are removed from these, the most visible places, there is no point in saying they have been withdrawn.

He then discusses the spread of disinformation both within the Soviet Union and abroad and the attempts to incite nationalities against each other and attempts to incite the Russian nation. He refers to this as a "double political game," since this action is not only against the Baltic nations but is also against Boris Yeltsin.

Landsbergis then refers to the documents drafted for the Lithuania-RSFSR Treaty and points out that these recognize the importance of full-participation by Lithuania's non-Lithuanian residents. He stresses the importance of publishing the appropriate treaty paragraphs in the press in the appropriate languages.

He goes on to list Soviet efforts abroad, including the use of economic pressure and threats, especially on countries who are dependent on the Soviet Union for raw materials. He mentions articles in the Polish press concerning the formation of a Lithuanian government in exile in

Poland. He emphasizes that such a request has not been made and expresses hope that there may not be a need to form such a government. He describes such reports as attempts to influence political positions through disinformation, and adds that individuals engaged in disinformation are not always sufficiently farsighted to anticipate the results of their efforts.

Landsbergis notes the efforts to depict Lithuania as out of control and with an absence of governmental leadership. He notes that sometimes the lack of a parliamentary quorum is being exploited and labeled as a "parliamentary crisis." He says "normal work" is the most effective means of resistance and urges everyone to be aware of the fact, especially with regard to the work of the legislature.

Landsbergis goes on to say: "I would like to propose a certain statement, which the Supreme Council could issue, not only in this direct, incentive, and political sense but also to recall what sort of Lithuania we are seeking: what that constitutional democracy—the republic—is; what comprises the essence of the independence, the future independent Lithuanian state.

"Those who wish to diminish the significance of this poll talk, and undoubtedly will continue to talk, about certain characteristics of the former independent Lithuanian Republic. They recall isolated characteristics that were not always positive and they will attempt to turn the people by saying: Do you really want a state that will contain such characteristics? If you do not care for such characteristics, consider perhaps whether it will be worthwhile to participate in the poll, etc.

"That is why the statement that I would like to propose to the Supreme Council is important, and not only for this poll. It would be a document which would be a cornerstone, if we succeed in polishing it well, both in our future constitution and our future state—the design for this state.

"We stress two points in the poll. The foundation of a Lithuanian Republic constitution and an essential characteristic of the state—independence, which the state is lacking, is a rather relative concept. Moreover, in accentuating independence, we must also accentuate constitutional democracy. However, what does that provide? Why is it necessary for the people?" Landsbergis then suggests that he either read the proposed statement or distribute copies for everyone to study.

He continues: "Thus, I am acquainting you with the proposal which is to be a statement by the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic. In seeking to establish whether citizens of the Lithuanian Republic agree with the constitutional and political assertion that Lithuania must be an independent, democratic republic, the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic has decided to conduct a poll of Lithuanian Republic citizens.

"The Supreme Council confirms, by means of this statement, that agreement with the mentioned phrase is to be interpreted as follows: A citizen concurring with this statement agrees with the fact that the Republic of Lithuania should be an independent state, with its system being a constitutional democracy, that is, a democratically elected law-based state—and of course, the government, a law-based state, with a democratically elected authority, whose majority rule is coordinated with the guaranteed individual and minority rights. The cornerstone of the concept of a constitutional democracy is the principal premise that all men are born with certain inalienable rights, that they cannot deny. These rights include a right to life, to freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. The state does not deprive them of these rights. On the contrary, the people establish a state to protect these rights.

"Guided by the concept of constitutional democracy, the Lithuanian people will also adopt a new constitution for Lithuania in which they will express their preferences for their state, providing for it limited powers and defining the formation of laws, executive power, and the manifestation of judicial institutions. In their activity, these institutions will base themselves on the power granted them by the constitution."

Landsbergis continues: "The principals supporting the establishment of a constitutional democracy have been formed within the Western democratic states over a period of many years. The foundations of these stem from ancient Greek, Roman, Christian, and other Western civilizations.

"Having decided to restore constitutional democracy, the Lithuanian people will unambiguously affirm their decision to return to the position of Western civilized nations. The constitution of Lithuania will be a document through which the Lithuanian people will agree among themselves, by using such words as to encompass the entire wisdom of civilization and lay the groundwork for freedom, peace, and prosperity in a modern, democratic, and independent republic.

"This constitutes a program document, which I think is necessary at this point, moving toward this poll whose significance is directed even much further."

Landsbergis concludes his speech by suggesting that the document be edited, reproduced, and distributed among the deputies. At 0845 GMT, Landsbergis concludes his report.

At 0847 GMT, Deputy Romualdas Ozolas discusses the signing of the agreement with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Aleksandras Abisala states that 91 deputies are in attendance.

At 0850 GMT, Landsbergis raises the question of the need to establish procedural order to release the

resources of the Lithuanian Independence Fund in Sweden for use by the Lithuanian state.

Landsbergis explains details of the fund's initiation and reads an appeal for such a fund as published in the Swedish press in May 1990. He adds that the fund was not established in former premier Prunskiene's name, but her name appears on the document representing the then state prime minister.

At 0855 GMT, the proposed draft resolution on the fund is read by Landsbergis.

Several deputies ask questions about the fund.

At 0858 GMT, a vote is taken on the resolution. It is adopted by a vote of 78 in favor.

The live relay of the plenary session concludes at 0901 GMT.

Troops Still at Vilnius Radio, TV Center

LD0502112191 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Hello, it is nice to be with you again. I would like to say that we are already speaking to you from our usual place at 49 Konarskis Street where you used to send your letters. Unfortunately, the rumor spreading among our staff today that those aggravating paratroopers were withdrawing from the radio and television center appeared to be wishful thinking and our joy turned out to be short-lived. They are still there. But we are still here and you are listening to us not them.

Moscow Proposes Talks

LD0502144991 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow has proposed to start consultations over the return of the occupied buildings to the Republic of Lithuania. This morning, the Lithuanian minister of telecommunications, Kostas Birulis, received a phone call from the Soviet deputy minister of telecommunications, Gennadiy Kudryavtsev, who expressed the wish to negotiate the issue of withdrawing Soviet troops from the television tower in Vilnius. Thirteen unarmed civilians were killed during the storming of the television tower on 13 January. The Soviet deputy minister of telecommunications also suggested that Lithuania should delegate an authorized official to Moscow to discuss the issue of Lithuanian post stamps.

At the very beginning of this year a special group of armed KGB men arrested [as heard] 22 million post stamps of the Republic of Lithuania. This event took place at the Lazdijai checkpoint of the Lithuanian-Polish border as the post stamps, printed in Germany, were being delivered via Poland to Lithuania. Some days ago the Lithuanian prime minister, Gedimanas Vagnorius, sent a note of protest to this effect to the Soviet premier, Valentin Pavlov.

Officials on TV Tower Incident

LD0402134991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Gennadiy Popov, cochairman of the Socialist Federation of Lithuanian Workers, asserts that the Soviet Army was invited to storm the Vilnius television tower in order to ensure the opinion of the workers' was broadcast, AFP reports. Anatoliy Subbotin, member of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the CPSU Platform, who remains barricaded inside the television tower, has issued an appeal to all people of peace, declaring that fascism will not win through. Subbotin denies he is a member of the Committee for National Salvation.

Moscow TV Discussion on Baltics Violence

LD0402120591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2042 GMT 26 Jan 91

["Before and After Midnight" program moderated by Vladimir Molchanov with participants Ion Drutse, writer and USSR Supreme Soviet member; Elem Klimov, film director; and Yegor Yakovlev, editor of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI]

[Text] [Molchanov] in the "Before and After Midnight" studio we have three talented people whom our program and, I hope, the millions of people who are now watching us, trust: They are writer Ion Pantelcyevich Drutse, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet; film director Elem Germanovich Klimov; and publicist Yegor Vladimirovich Yakovlev.

I'd like to hear from you an answer to a very, very painful question: Today, in this atmosphere of hatred, in this tragic situation for our country and the world, what in your opinion does the decency and responsibility of the journalist, the writer, the man with the camera consist of?

The last words were "film camera," so perhaps I will begin. Vladimir, I have come along to take part in your program, although not so long ago—together with my colleagues in the arts—I signed an appeal not to participate in entertainment programs on Central Television at present. We all disagree with the policy of the present leadership of Central Television. Moreover, Andrey Smirnov and I sent a telegram to [Gosteleradio chairman] Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko asking him to cancel us from the "Kinoserpantin" program and other programs we take part in.

But I have come here to talk to you because I knew the subject of our conversation: the, alas, sad topic of the events—tragic events, bloody events—in Vilnius and Riga, where quite a lot of people lost their lives, most unfortunately, and many were hurt. Among those who died were colleagues of mine and of yours. Andris

Siapens died. He was buried yesterday. Two other cameramen were wounded, one of them very seriously. A Finnish producer was among those who suffered during those stormy events in Riga.

Well, what about members of my profession, the documentary film-makers, who incidentally have emerged with great credit in these years of perestroyka? Among all the film-makers they have created a great many just, honest, and talented works and worked very efficiently. They have responded, and they are the ones who have gone into all the hot spots and penetrated where they were not ordinarily admitted. Previously, as you know, in the time of stagnation, our documentaries were on a low level, shall we say, and varnished reality—falsified and prevaricated. But now the majority of our documentaries are quite different.

The people, besides doing their professional duty, are also doing their duty as citizens. That is what the video and television operators and directors did both in Vilnius during the storming of the television tower, and in Riga when the Latvian Foreign Ministry was stored. Shots were fired. And as my colleagues in Riga assure me, the shots were aimed—were aimed precisely at the people with film and video cameras. Those were shots which, alas, hit their targets. Why? Because they're afraid of witnesses—witnesses to wrongful acts, I should say. They are afraid, and so they fire at the people with the cameras. And my colleagues deserve to be remembered with words of respect for the fact that they, nonetheless, go in and film, and thereby display both their human and their professional integrity.

[Molchanov] Thank you. Ion Pantelevyevich, I know you've just returned from Riga.

[Drutse] Yes. You know, to put it this way, the whole country—every person—is now mainly agonized by one question: What is happening in our country? And second, what to do? We traveled there, this commission of the Supreme Soviet, already in the knowledge that there was great tension there; and with great alarm for the further reason that Riga, and the Baltic region generally, in some sense, all three of those Baltic republics have for many years set us a standard, both in culture and in—I don't know—in folklore as understood in a certain way, and as it were, each person associates with them certain pleasant recollections, certain acquaintances, certain hopes, certain aspirations. Suddenly all that has been transformed in some dramatic way.

I have to say that Riga now literally shook me. It's not that the people—cultured people—masses of people are spending the night in the streets in the center of the city, at their bonfires, the barricades; but the feeling is of a last step, as it were, after which comes the most terrible thing—bloodshed. And I was shaken by these two camps that have formed, these two forces which oppose each other and confront each other in some sort of state of obsession.

Very many Latvians—an old Latvian woman in the cathedral, where they had organized a small sort of medical center to give help, if someone's ill during the night, and so on. There are nurses on duty there. And one old woman had been on duty for 36 hours at a stretch, I was told, because no one relieved her. The medicines are brought from home; each person brings whatever they have lying about. There's a huge collection there on the table. And she had a very radiant face, a wonderful woman, and I sat next to her and asked her: Well, how long do you think all this is going to last? She said to me, with this somehow very radiant, even cheerful face, you know: If we die, we'll die free.

Imants Ziedonis, the people's poet of Latvia, which whom I was strolling through Riga, said to me: You see, we have this nocturnal carnival against a background of terror. Indeed, in nighttime Kamenogorsk one had some sort of sinister forebodings.

We met the commander of the Baltic military okrug, Colonel-General Fedor Mikhaylovich Kuzmin; and at the Writers' Union we had a meeting with cultural figures.

How to find a bridge? I personally have the feeling that in general, the train of salvation or the train of harmony hasn't yet left the station; that something could still be done. Because in general we've got to think today not of how terrible it is, but we've got to think that we've got children, we've got grandchildren; we've got to think who we're going to leave this country to. If we don't leave them peace, we'll leave them nothing. Whatever may be our (?economic successes)—they'll simply all be lost. We have to find a way to grope toward that bridge to peace.

My personal opinion is that at the beginning, in the process of perestroyka, a multiplicity of parties, groupings, tendencies were formed among us, people grouped around various things; and then began a wild polarization. In the end it turned out that all these conflicts were ethnic—whether in the Baltic, or in the Caucasus, or in Moldavia. It seems to me that polarization took place through the fault of the center. Solely and only through the fault of the center. In some interval of time, the center faltered: Should we carry perestroyka through, should we put the brake on, are we going in the right direction or not quite in the right direction? This was felt immediately in the localities, that there was no absolute confidence, that things had become a little shaky. Then of course the most aggressive forces began to consolidate, and the national forces began to consolidate, fearing that we were going back to Stalinism.

It seems to me that it is the system that is at the bottom of all the problems: We must change the system; we shall of course get nothing done unless we change it. If one takes the system—I don't know how to describe it, some people call it Stalinism, others call it call it communist ravings, others something else again. As an artist, I find Dostoyevsky and his famous novel "The Devils" come

closest: Bedevilment [besovstvo] lies at the root of everything. The policy of bedevilment consists in dividing people up into two camps and setting these two camps against one another for their mutual destruction—such as we in fact have today in every area. Form two camps and keep them like that, as Arutyanyan said, leaving them in an angry state. This is a tragedy, a moral and political and economic tragedy, too.

The economic potential of any state consists in the sum of human energy. Where does the spiritual and physical energy of the Soviet man go? Into confrontation! Whether he stands in the same camp alongside the Latvians holding out for sovereignty; whether he stands alongside the Rubiks party; wherever he stands, nevertheless, all our energy and the creative potential of our people goes in confrontation, and that is what we have created. It seems to me that without an analysis of the entire system and without dismantling it altogether, we shall be unable to resolve these problems of our. Moreover, I am very much afraid that in the future—these conflicts all have a nationalist tinge at the moment, that of two camps—they could very rapidly go over into territorial conflicts. One oblast could be intolerant in its attitude to a neighboring oblast, so to speak, or they could go over into social conflicts, between town and country and so forth. This is a very dangerous thing.

[Molchanov] Thank you. Yegor Vladimirovich, the newspaper you direct MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, has just recently published a call to journalists: If you cannot speak the truth, do not lie, keep silent. That is how the appeal sounds, apparently.

[Yakovlev] That is the appeal, but it is unfortunately not meeting with support everywhere. You asked what was important about this, where there is enmity. It is truth, all the same. Telling a half-truth will not help to reconcile people.

May I thank you for showing this footage in this program, above all the footage from Vilnius—which despite the instructions of the Supreme Soviet to show these shots on Central Television, has not all been shown yet; only a part of it has been shown. There is a 50-minute tape. Despite the instructions of the Supreme Soviet, this is not being done. So anti-constitutional behavior is, so to speak, like getting the flu, and it is spreading throughout the country.

(?As you know) much is being said about truth and about falsehood. I keep thinking that people have been imprisoned in our country for everything: imprisoned for jokes, imprisoned for the ear of what was taken by a hungry person, imprisoned for being late to work. But I cannot cite a single example of someone being imprisoned for lying. We have never imprisoned anyone for lying in this country.

You know, when the period of reform began in 1985, many people said that those who lied during that period should be called to order, to account, to moral account. Indeed, why not call to account former Chairman of the Union of Writers Markov, who under Brezhnev said, in memoirs which he did not write: Thank you, Leonid Ilyich, you have taught the Soviet writer how to write. I did not at the time really share this charge, this standpoint that others should be called to account. Now I am beginning to think that I was wrong; because, generally speaking, no immunity against lies has been developed over these past six years. You realize, what is happening here at Central Television and what is happening at publications—it is like a swamp that was lying stagnant, but as soon as the first elements of the crisis began, the lies started in a great many publications, just like bubbles of gas issue from a swamp.

You know, I was, so to speak, one of the people who once set up the Union of Journalists. But I have long since lost interest in it—there were reasons for this. And so when several of my colleagues came to me and said that they did not wish to be in the Union of Journalists, members of Kravchenko's Union of Journalists, I agreed with them, generally speaking, and I also support them. All the more so because your chairman is, alas, a USSR people's deputy from the Union of Journalists.

You see, what is being done to television—you were speaking about this document of the founders. There is another very important thought there, or perhaps not there, I can't remember now. You see, people, my colleagues, who lied in 1968 when we invaded Czechoslovakia, and who understood that it was an anti-human and brutal act, they hoped that, nonetheless, they would lie today but that sometime in the future it would become the truth. The horror is that the people who lie today, as Nevzorov now has done, they realize that it is a lie today. It is obvious even today. So what must the extent of moral decline be today for someone to tell a lie to people's faces, knowing that the people around know that it is a lie. This is something very serious.

[Molchanov] Thank you all. And now, this is the duty of our program, which is on the air at the end of the bloody January of 1991—a few seconds of silence in memory of those who died.

Military Patrol Incidents in Vilnius Reported

LD0302120291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 3 Feb 91

[Text] I will begin with what has been announced by the Internal Affairs Ministry's watch duty personnel. You have heard some of the things recorded last night, including some information about incidents involving military patrols in Klaipeda and in Kazlu Ruda.

In [word indistinct] at around 1800, at the small bus station on [word indistinct] street, five soldiers dressed in [word indistinct] uniforms inflicted beatings upon Danguole Ubartaite and her brother, Jurgis Ub Artas. This incident is being investigated.

Moreover, in Kazul Ruda, the military beat up an individual, named (Beras Savolis), because when slightly

intoxicated, he made an insulting geture in the direction of a passing patrol vehicle. Of course it is a pity that the citizen [word indistinct] and was unable to control his two fingers, however, one must be mindful of the fact that patrols also have itchy fingers.

You have already heard about these incidents, but here is another one, received an hour ago from the Internal Affairs Ministry watch person, Albinas Karvelis. At 0400, on (Raznitis) street in Vilnius, near house no. 59, an intoxicated military unit ensign, Vladimir (Malis), fired two shots at the building's wall. A resident from a neighboring house, Igor Mackevich, also intoxicated, who also happened to be in the vicinity took away his pistol and threw it into a trashcan. Both brave men were apprehended by militia workers.

Journalists were informed of all these happenings, at the morning briefing held at the Supreme Council building.

Bickauskas on Talks With USSR Delegation

LD0302121191 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] The beginning of negotiations will depend not only on us but also on the goodwill of the Soviet Union. Regrettably there is not much of that on their part. This was stated to the Lithuanian news agency ELTA by Egidijus Bickauskas, the Lithuanian Government's permanent representative in Moscow. Yesterday in Moscow he participated as an observer at the meeting of the Soviet Union's Federation Council, which appointed Kremlin delegations for contacts with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The representatives of the Lithuanian Government, Egidijus Bickauskas, has had an opportunity to speak at the Federation Council meeting. He gave an explanation to how events developed in Lithuania on 11th - 13 January and handed in a few statements denying and exposing all lies about events in Lithuania that come to the Kremlin and to the Soviet media.

According to Egidijus Bickauskas, a rather unbiased speech at the Federation Council meeting was made by Georgiy Tarazevich who after the tragic events has visited Lithuania with a special authorization from President Gorbachev. Georgiy Tarazevich said at the meeting in the Kremlin that it was imperative to immediately start a political dialogue and clear out who was guilty of the tragedy in Vilnius. Egidijus Bickauskas defined the atmosphere of the meeting of the Soviet Federation Council as very depressive, while Mikhail Gorbachev in his opinion was among the moderate ones. The majority of the speakers proposed to take drastic measures. We must realize that the Soviets are what they are and that hardly anything can change them in the near future. But even with such we unfortunately have to negotiate, said Egidijus Bickauskas to the Lithuanian news agency ELTA.

Landsbergis Receives Shchit Delegation

LD0202212191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Russian 2015 GMT 3 Feb 91

[Text] Members of a special commission from Shchit, the Union for Protection of Servicemen and Their Families, were received by V. Landsbergis today.

The group consists of highly qualified lawyers who carried out an independent investigation into the tragic events in Baku and Nagorno-Karabakh. They presented their conclusions and the assessment of their findings to the country's leadership and to international organizations.

The aim of the delegation's visit to Lithuania is to carry out an independent investigation. The government granted them special powers to cary out the task. This decision was adopted at the meeting of representatives of Shchit with G. Vagnoris, prime minister of the republic.

Landsbergis Receives Polish Delegation

LD0102220591 Warsaw PAP in English 1725 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] vilnius, Feb 1—A delegation of the Citizens Parliamentary Club (OKP) ended a visit to Vilnius today.

In the course of the visit, Polish parliamentarians were received by Chairman of the Lithuanian Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis and discussed the situation in Lithuania and forms of aid which the Polish side could grant to that country.

The delegation also met with a group of Lithuanian deputies of Polish descent.

USSR Colonel on Army Draft in Lithuania

LD0202105391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] The date of 1 February is important in that the Soviet Union's president has extended the fall draft to the Soviet Army to this date.

ELTA has been told by Colonel Konstantain (?Goldov), head of Poltical Department at the Military Commissariat in Lithuania, that during this extended period of time some 700 youths from Lithuania have been sent to the Army. This constitutes 17.5 percent of the plan.

According to Col. (?Goldov), all youths were volunteers, a half of them Lithuanians, and the paratroopers sent to Lithuania have not used force against the youths because they have only been a means of psychological and moral influence. Col. (?Goldov) pointed out that the paratroopers have other tasks—to help the Communist Party regain its property and silence mass information media. They also have other tasks, recalled the colonel, but did not go into details.

Damage in Lithuania Estimated at $57 Million

AU0402090591 Paris AFP in English 0622 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Vilnius, Lithuania, Feb 4 (AFP)—Damage incurred during a crackdown by Soviet troops in this Soviet Baltic republic last month has been valued at 36 million roubles (57 million dollars at the official exchange rate), Lithuanian government spokesman Audrius Ajoubalis said Sunday.

Fourteen people died here when Soviet army troops stormed the television building here on January 13.

Mr. Ajoubalis said that damage to the radio and television headquarters alone had been estimated at 14 million roubles (22.4 million dollars).

Lithuania has been locked in conflict with the central authorities in Moscow since last year, when it issued a declaration of independence from the Soviet Union.

Sajudis Allegedly Persecuting Opponents

LD3101233191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Report by A. Kraminov from Vilnius; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] A state of emergency has not been declared in Vilnius but the Army is still guarding the roads leading to the television and radio tower, where the tragedy occurred on the night of 13 January, as well as the building of the television center. The Lithuanian television staff are refusing to come back here. They broadcast programs from the parliament building. The square in front of it has been turned into a place of mourning for those who perished. Nervousness and tension are of course falling gradually but one cannot say that life is going back to normal. It is quite unlikely that it will be possible to get back to the way things were.

By the looks of it things appear normal. Cosmonaut Viktor Gorbatov, the deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is receiving the public. But most of his visitors are refusing to be filmed even from the back. As they explain they fear the vengeance of the Sajudis supporters.

This Lithuanian woman is speaking about the persecution she was subject to after she had made at a rally a speech which the Sajudis did not like.

[Unidentified woman] I spoke at a rally. Do you think I have had any peace afterwards. They pursued me in various ways. They did not give me a minute's peace but inundated me with phone calls, even shouting to me: You have sold Lithuania. [passage omitted]

No Orders For Joint Patrols In Latvia

LD0502135791 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0700 GMT 5 Feb 91

[Text] No orders have yet (?been received); therefore, the joint militia and army patrols in Latvia are not taking place, the DIENA agency was told by Colonel (Janis Muiznicks) deputy chief of staff at the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Latvia. Thus the decree of the president of the USSR is not being carried out in Latvia. [Words indistinct] the patrols (?started) earlier in the city of Riga by the army and the militia will (?continue).

'No Information' on Latvian Radio, TV Occupation

LD0402212991 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] In connection with the many telephone calls today to the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia and to the radio and the television [organization] on the possible occupation of the television and the radio in the immediate future, we communicated with the State Secutiry Committee. The leadership of this committee attested that they have no information of such a character at their disposal.

Cameraman Injured in OMON Attack Dies

LD0502161391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1430 GMT 5 Feb 91

[Summary] Gvido Zvaigzne, cameraman of Latvian Film studio, died in Riga hospital early this morning. He was wounded by the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Unit] militia group during the attack on the Latvian Ministry of Interior Affairs on 20 January.

Investigation of TV Reporter Attack Continues

LD0402202291 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga February 4 TASS—The Procurator's Office of the Latvian Republic continues the investigation of an attack on Leningrad TV reporter Aleksandr Nevzorov.

A car carrying Nevzorov and three men of the Riga militia special task force was fired on in Riga on the night of February 2.

Latvia was the third Baltic republic after Lithuania and Estonia where the filming group of the popular "600 Seconds" programme of Leningrad television worked.

Sajudis Movement members threatened to kill Nevzorov after he described the viewpoint of Lithuanian militia special task force officers on the situation in the republic.

In an interview with the Sodruzhestvo radio station run by the United Council of Latvian Work Collectives

(representing mostly Russian-speaking people) Nevzorov said: "Small wonder that the attack took place.

"The attackers could have learnt about my movements by listening to telephone planning. Usual preparations preceded the attack: telephone talks of who, where and when will go."

He promised to send a video clip to the station, which was suddenly interrupted while being telecast for Latvia from Leningrad on February 1.

The telecast was stopped at a time when Viktor Alksnis, an all-Union legislator, was about to reply to a question from an anchorman regarding who had received arms in Latvia and in what quantities.

A radio reporter at the Sodruzhestvo station asked Nevzorov the following question: "Do you feel it possible to prevent the civil war we now stand on the threshold of which?"

"It will be possible," Nevzorov replied, noting at the same time that supporters of Latvia's secession from the USSR seized virtually all the mass media. "When a man dares to express his viewpoint, different from others, baiting begins," he added.

"I'm just a career reporter who has a whim to tell the truth," Nevzorov noted when he was named a progressive journalist during the interview.

He said: "I believe that we must preserve the Union at any cost. It is the only way to save the life, honour and dignity of all the Russian-speaking people who live outside the Russian Federation".

Ivans Calls for Pressure on World Public Opinion

PM0402200691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "Mr. Ivans' Surprise Revelations"]

[Text] Riga—In the Latvian legislature Dainis Ivans, first deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, has delivered a report on the results of his two-week foreign tour.

"Don't entertain the illusion that our case will be resolved in Moscow," Ivans stated. He cited this argument to clarify his point: Being under pressure from world public opinion, Moscow is only "simulating talks with the Baltic republics." It has no intention of granting "freedom and independence" to these republics. The Latvians themselves must, he said, "win them at the barricades," and efforts must continue in this connection to persuade world public opinion that "the Baltic question is not the USSR's internal affair."

A sharply "denunciatory" tone characterized the criticism of "the USSR's propaganda apparatus," which is supposedly conducting a "large-scale campaign of disinformation of world public opinion about the fact that national minorities are oppressed in Latvia."

Typically, Ivans did not omit to mention that among the high-ranking figures with whom he had meetings across the ocean were CIA staffers. It only remains to speculate what the connection could be.

Aluksne Militia Backs Latvian Leaders

LD0102205591 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1000 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] We have received an open letter from militia workers in Aluksne rayon, addressed to the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Council of Ministers Ivars Godmanis, and Minister of Internal Affairs Aloizs Vaznis. It states: We, militia officials of Aluksne Rayon, are deeply indignant at the attitude of one part of the Riga militia to the lawfully elected Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, and the Council of Ministers of the republic, and at the expression of no confidence in Minister of Internal Affairs Aloizs Vaznis. At a meeting held on 28 January 1991 in the University Hall, this group of the Riga militiamen demonstrated to the entire republic its low level of culture and ethics. Such a viewpoint can very much harm the prevention of crime in the city of Riga. We condemn the criminal activity of the special purpose militia unit of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, OMON, as a result of which militia workers and civilian residents have perished. We fully support the legislative acts adopted by the lawfully elected Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia and the Council of Ministers of the republic in connection with the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, expressed in the declaration of 4 May 1990. This open letter is signed by more than fifty militia officials of Aluksne Rayon.

Clashes in Latvian Capital Reviewed

LD0302081891 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1845 GMT 27 Jan 91

[From the "Authors Television," "Namedni", program]

[Text] [Announcer] Hello there, this is the "Namedni" program with the week's news. There has been shooting in two gulfs—the Gulf of Riga and the Persian Gulf. Never mind a hundred rubles, you have to have small notes. Those are the main topics of the week since we met last Sunday.

Let's take it from the top. Here is our first bulletin: domestic events. That was how our report from Latvia ended. It managed to go out on the air, including in Latvia. Soon afterwards, Latvian television interrupted all programs on all channels and started showing completely different pictures.

The events of that night will already be familiar to you. Its deplorable toll was four dead. Let us note some of the main points.

First, the Baltic republics regularly have their Gustav Husaks. As healthy forces in society, they are ready to shoulder responsibility for the destiny of the people—with Army support.

Second, the Latvia-wide Committee of National Salvation has proclaimed that power has been fully placed in its hands. People's Deputy Alksnis spoke at length about the need for this. The cochairman of the committee is Alfred Rubiks, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, the minority party in the legislature. The CPSU, formerly the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, has on more than one occasion attempted to take power after losing elections to legislatures or to constituent assemblies.

Third, in his statement Mikhail Gorbachev condemned both non-parliamentary routes to power and appeals from political forces to the troops. On the same day, Gorbachev simultaneously received Gorbunovs, the legitimate state leader of Latvia; and Rubiks, the illegitimate state leader.

Fourth, even according to accounts that put the Special Purpose Militia Units in the best light, the seizure of the Latvian Ministry of Internal Affairs building was carried out by them on suspicion that the wife of one of the detachment members had been raped. Is revenge an acceptable reason for the actions of the subunits of the Union Ministry of Internal Affairs, actions in which people are killed?

The day after the shooting, this was the scene beside the Latvian Ministry of Internal Affairs building.

[Unidentified man] [passage indistinct] It's crazy to have to defend yourself against your former friends.

[Announcer] We must pay tribute to the courage of the cameramen who shot the film. Carrying out their duties, they made it possible for us to judge the events first hand. Our Latvian colleague Andris Slapins died. A Finnish TV cameraman and Vladimir Brezhnev, a member of the Vzglyad film crew—from the studio in which our program and all the other programs of Central Television's Youth Program Editorial office are broadcast—were injured.

[Unidenified interviewer] Volodya, how are you?

[Brezhnev] Thank you very much.

[Interview] We must thank you. What are you thanking us for?

[Brezhnev] For your courage.

[Interviewer] Did you foresee that it could turn out like this?

[Brezhnev] I expected something to happen, but quite honestly I didn't really expect to be personally involved.

[Interviewer] This may sound like a silly question, but were you afraid

[Brezhnev] No.

[Announcer] That was Vladimir Brezhnev. And now a clip from Danish television.

[Begin recording in Danish with superimposed translation into Russian] The situation changed very suddenly. Everything was quiet, and suddenly the shooting started and this tense situation erupted. [commotion heard] Those are bullets flying over the Freedom Movement. It was a most extraordinary situation. We arrived on Saturday expecting to do a piece of relations between Latvian seamen and the Danish fish-processing industry. We ended up covering something quite different. [end recording]

Latvia's Equal Rights Group Boycotts Legislature

LD3102232691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Report by correspondent Bobin from Riga; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Today Riga residents and the whole of Latvia are taking stock of the first month of the year. [passage omitted]

At the center of attention is a parliamentary crisis. A third of the deputies who are members of the Equal Rights group have not been taking part in the republic's supreme soviet proceedings for two weeks now. And I would now like to ask Yevgeniy Nikolayevich Yaqupets, the deputy chairman of the group: Do you intend to go back and work in parliament?

[Yaqupets] Yes, our group is prepared at any time to embark on joint work with the People's Front group within the walls of our republic's Supreme Soviet. To achieve this, we are ready to take part in the work of the conciliation commission on any conditions, and we have passed this proposal on to the Latvian Republic's Supreme Soviet.

Equal Rights Group Warns Against Nationalism

PM0402100791 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 18 Jan 91 p 1

[Appeal issued by the "Equal Rights" faction to the peoples of Latvia]

[Text] Political and economic adventurism is destroying our republic. We are surrounded by calumny, lies, and provocation—minor and gross—endangering people's lives. The barricades in Old Riga and on the city's bridges are no less than a crime.

Are those who have sent people to the barricades really expecting tanks. If so, will not a high price be exacted for these props which are fit only only for a tear-jerking movie which will subsequently be sold for hard currency. If not, their crime still lies ahead.

The alliance between the Congress of Citizens and the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet is nothing more than an ordinary parliamentary coup. Affairs in the Supreme Soviet are now being run by a few dozen national-radical deputies, and they are playing for very high political stakes. In these conditions the "Equal Rights" faction deems it impossible to take part in the work of the republic Supreme Soviet.

The formation of a totalitarian regime of nationalist persuasion which gives to some at the expense of others is under way.

We deputies of the "Equal Rights" faction urge all political and social movements to halt. Confrontation on the streets of Riga could lead to bloodshed. The political ambitions of a group of political intriguers will be paid for with peoples' lives.

It is sad that barricades have also been erected in people's hearts. The hysteria in the mass media has already so changed people's minds that the very idea of compromise seems impossible.

Nevertheless, we do urge the opposing forces to sit down at the negotiating table for the sake of our Latvia's salvation.
S. Dimanis, chairman of the "Equal Rights" faction.

Latvian Salvation Committee on Assuming Power

PM0402102591 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 17 Jan 91 p 1

["All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee Political Statement: The People Make the Choice"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] Dear compatriots, the decisive hour, when the situation in the republic has become critical, has arrived. The ruling circles have brought Latvia to the brink of national catastrophe. The course of establishing a bourgeois dictatorship pursued by the Supreme Soviet and government has brought the people of Latvia to the brink of economic collapse and curtailment of democracy. As the mouthpiece of the Latvian People's Front [LPF], republic television and radio have launched frenzied anti-Soviet, nationalist propaganda and are fueling tension and hysteria.

The LPF faction in the Supreme Soviet has entered into an open deal with the Citizens Congress—an alternative power structure of profascist persuasion.

The real causes of all this lie in the flouting of the Constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and international norms on human rights.

This cannot be tolerated any more.

In this situation the All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee, at the demand of working people, assumes responsibility for the future of Soviet Latvia and proclaims the transfer into its hands of all state power for the period of stabilizing the situation and the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet and government.

The All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee advocates:

—a sovereign, rule-of-law Latvia as part of a renewed USSR. A decision to withdraw the Latvian SSR from the USSR can be made only by a national referendum in accordance with legislation;

—the socialist path of national revival and renewal of statehood based on internationally recognized norms of common human values;

—confirming the equal and inalienable rights of all citizens based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

—raising the living standard of all inhabitants and ensuring their social protection.

The All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee deems invalid the Declaration of 4 May 1990 and all legislative and legally binding acts of the Latvian Supreme Soviet and its government adopted in breach of the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions, decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, resolutions and legislative acts of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR presidential decrees.

It instructs the committee's presidium to draw up a list of government personnel and submit it for confirmation by the All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee.

The committee abolishes departments and other state organs set up contrary to USSR and Latvian SSR laws. It instructs the newly created government to suspend the resolutions of the former government of Latvia on raising prices for foodstuffs and services until the elaboration of a mechanism to index the population's current income and provide requisite compensation for material losses arising from the increase in retail prices.

The All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee is ready to cooperate with all socipolitical forces advocating the socialist path for society's development.

Today everyone is faced with the choice of their future life and which ideas to profess. True perestroyka requires defense of the socialist choice of our people's future and of the republic's prosperity.

Soviet Latvia must remain in the renewed USSR.

The All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee's Political Statement was unanimously supported by the All-Latvia People's Assembly.

Riga, 15 January 1991

Riga Stock Market Exchange Opens

LD0202231391 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] A stock market exchange has opened in Latvia's capital, Riga. This is one of the important steps towards a market economy. In April the exchange will start trading in goods and in the future will open the sale of securities as well. The stock market exchange is situated in a building in the old part of the Latvian capital built especially for the Riga exchange 150 years ago. In a television interview a republican government spokesman said that the political situation in Latvia has stabilized and that has made it possible to expand business activities.

Latvia, Estonia Committees Reject Referendum

LD0502070491 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0700 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] The Committee of Latvia and the Committee of Estonia have adopted an appeal to the citizens of Latvia and Estonia. It states:

Considering that a referendum under conditions of military occupation and annexation with the participation of citizens of the occupying state, the USSR, is unlawful, and its results may be used for the legalization of the consequences of occupation and annexation, the Committee of Latvia and the Committee of Estonia call upon the citizens of Latvia and Estonia, in such circumstances, to boycott any referendum or questionnaire in the form of a referendum—irrespective of who organizes it.

Estonia To Hold Referendum 3 March

LD0402155691 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] The Estonian Supreme Soviet has decided to hold a referendum on the independence of the Republic of Estonia on 3 March. The people will have to decide whether they want the statehood and independence of the Republic of Estonia to be restored.

Estonian Police, Militia To Merge 1 March

LD0402132491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A law has been adopted in Estonia in accordance with which the police and militia will be united in a single service as of 1 March this year. The guardians of law and order will get a new uniform and a salary of up to 600 rubles a month.

Tallinn Official on Militia Situation

LD0102184591 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Interview with Raik Saat, head of the Tallinn Internal Affairs Directorate, by unidentified correspondent on 1 February; place not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] It was around two years ago that all bilingual people were invited to join the militia, and now we are in 1991. Raik Saat, head of internal affairs in Tallinn, what is the situation here now? We do know that quite soon we will change over from militia work to police work.

[Saat] Things have become quite bad in Tallinn now. In connection with the changeover from militia to police, and with many doubts about future militia work, a very large number of present members of the militia have started leaving the law enforcement profession. Either they travel to other areas of the Union or they enter completely different sectors of the economy; these are the people who are not satisfied with the salary and conditions. Or they retire because the law on militia pensions allows early retirement. The situation has now reached the point where there are resignations almost every day and—alas—there are no newcomers. The lower the numbers the less effective the militia work, as it is now. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Who are those who are leaving? Is it the militia members who happened to be living in Estonia by chance or after doing their army service?

[Saat] On the whole the majority of those leaving now are young men of Russian origin. They are men of the kind whom I would say we rate the best, who have experience and have so far been working very conscientiously, as far as the situation here has permitted. They are also men who have been working for 15 years or more, which means that they are no longer sure about their future: Will they be able to continue their work in Estonia until they retire—pension matters are at the moment still undecided? For this reason, people are worried about their future and are trying to find jobs close to the Republic of Estonia—the oblasts here—or maybe they will even venture further afield to serve their last two or three years and then return to Tallinn, with the families usually having been left behind. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] It is 1 February today and, as is known, the joint Pugo-Yazov directive comes into force today about the institution of militia and army joint patrols being instituted. Raik Saar, please tell me what relations are like between the Tallinn Internal Affairs Directorate and Tallinn garrison.

[Saat] Quite businesslike, as relations between two official establishments should be. As far as joint patrols are concerned they will not take place because resolutions and decrees for Estonia have been adopted to this effect.

We have, however, always had cooperation of this kind with the garrison, which is very necessary because there are criminals and those who breach public order amongst the military, too, and so we have been cooperating in this respect. I hope that this kind of relationship will continue.

[Correspondent] That was Raik Saat, head of Tallinn Internal Affairs Directorate.

Intermovement Congress Attacks Perestroyka

LD0202210391 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] The second congress of the Estonian Intermovement was held in Kohtla-Jaerve today. The report by USSR People's Deputy Kogan, chairman of the Coordinating Council of the movement, contained sharp criticism of the Union and republican leadership. The report asserted that the perestroyka under way in the USSR has the aim of destroying the state and playing the peoples of the country off against each other. The blame for the policy being conducted by the legislatures of the Baltic states is borne by the CPSU Central Committee and the top leadership of the country, he believes.

In spite of its negative evaluation of the changes taking place in the country, the congress included in the document it adopted a clause about how at the present stage the Intermovement considers its main task to ensure the victory of the socialist choice and the construction on that basis of a legal, humane, and democratic state.

Four Reported Detained in Tallinn Murder Case

LD0102220191 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1700 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Altogther, four persons, one man and three women, have been detained suspected of involvement in the robbery attack in Tallinn on the Swedish trade union leaders Bertil Whinberg and Ove Fredriksson. This was confirmed by the Swedish Consul in Tallinn, Haakan Damm, for TT [Swedish news agency]. One man and a woman were detained in Tallinn on Wednesday [30 January], while the two other women were said to have been detained yesterday.

Estonian Representative in Appointed to RSFSR

LD0102140691 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1500 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Excerpt] Yevgeniy Golikov has been appointed permanent representative of the Republic of Estonia Government at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Government. [passage omitted]

RSFSR

Deputies Urge Gorbachev, Pavlov To Resign

LD1502130291 Moscow Radio Rossi Network in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Feb 91

[Text] Now I will briefly describe a statement which was published in the KURANTY newspaper today. It was signed by RSFSR People's Deputies Chelnokov, (Kamchatov), Yeltsov, (Molotsov), Yusnikov, Oleynik and (Tsenik). Eighty-three signatures altogether.

The statement notes in particular that recently the leadership of the USSR, headed by President Mikhail Gorbachev, has been taking steps directed against the people and is issuing decrees and decisions in violation of the Constitution of the USSR. How many times will the union leadership attempt to make the impoverished, robbed people pay for the scandalous incompetence of the leadership? Under such conditions, the authors of the protest statement consider further cooperation with the union leadership fundamentally impossible—whatever form it might take—in the administration of the country and they demand the resignations of President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Pavlov, and their whole team, first and foremost Yazov, Kryuchkov, Pugo, Yanayev, and Kravchenko, the abolition of all structures of presidential rule in the USSR, and the handover of absolute power to the republics and to the coordinating council of the leaders of the republics which should be set up by them themselves. I remind you that this statement was published today on the pages of the capital's KURANTY newspaper.

RSFSR Protests Move To Switch Radio Rossii

LD0402214991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] I shall begin the first news bulletin with a statement of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ministry of Press and Mass Information. The document says the following: From 1 February the broadcast of Radio Rossii has been prohibited on the Mayak and the First all-Union program wavebands. Prohibiting the broadcast of state republican radio without agreement with the Russian Government is the crudest violation of the republic's sovereignty and of the USSR law on the press and other mass information media. The change to a channel which covers a little over 60 percent of the population of the RSFSR violates the links between the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic and its inhabitants. Such actions from the center inflict considerable economic and political damage on Russia.

The RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Information stresses in its statement that the Russian Federation is the only union republic which does not have its own radio and television broadcasting channels. The statement protests these provocative actions in relation to a sovereign republic.

The RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Information states that if the question of a transfer of one of the all-Union television and radio channels to the authority of the RSFSR is not solved in the very near future, the government of the republic will be faced with the need to take emergency measures to defend its sovereign right and constitutional obligation to provide information to the population.

Media Ministry Statement

LD0502103391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0948 GMT 5 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS)—The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ministry for the Press and Mass Media has issued a statement which says: Broadcasting by "Radio Rossii" on frequencies of the "Mayak" radio station and of the first all-Union channel has been prohibited since 1 February. The document stresses that "if the issue of handing over one of the all-Union television and radio channels to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR is not resolved in the near future, the Russian Government will be compelled to take emergency measures to protect its own sovereign right and its constitutional obligation to inform the population."

As a TASS correspondent was informed at USSR Gosteleradio, the transfer of Russian broadcasting to the second radio channel is not considered to be a "prohibition." It is proposed, in the future, to hand over the second radio channel, as well as the second all-Union television broadcasting channel, to the disposal of the Russian Television and Radio Corporation.

Media Head Speaks on Changes

LD0402234891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer Igor Vasilkov] As I already said at the beginning of our evening slot, a news conference was given in the building of the All-Russian State Televison and Radio Broadcasting Company by the heads of this company. Our correspondent recorded part of this news conference. While our evening broadcast is going on this report is being prepared, and we shall acquaint you with it in installments. Listen if you would to the first installments of the recording of the news conference by the heads of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company. On this tape you will hear Anatoliy Lushcheniko, the general director, and Oleg Poptsov, the president of our television and radio company. [passage omitted]

[Begin Poptsov recording] [passage omitted] Having heard about this, we adopted a decision to switch to the third program—well, strictly and honestly speaking, we were given an ultimatum—to a program which is now called Program Radio 2. This has a truncated distribution because it does not cover the whole territory of the RSFSR and its population, somewhere in the region of 60-65 kilometers from the center. It is perfectly understandable that the step taken by the supreme leadership of the country merely reaffirms the fact that since the Baltic events the country has embarked on a new political spiral and a completely different political situation is developing. The policy of confrontation is intensifying, the state of discord in society is increasing, and in this connection the position of the mass media, which preserve their loyalty to the ideas of transformation proclaimed in 1985-86 and remind the country's leadership of its responsibility for the situation of the past six years, and which try to halt the slide of society to the right—to the zone of the most cruel reaction—the position of the mass means of propaganda upholding these views is becoming complicated.

I think that each party in our society and each citizen—as I understand it, including the president—has made its choice, and we do not intend to change our view. But we are worried by the fact that the situation of Radio Rossii is a link in a common chain of steps in a blatant attack by reaction on glasnost. We are left regretting that the supreme leadership of the country does not share these views, because everything that is being done in relation to the IZVESTIYA newspaper—the attempts to drive our the editorial colleagium, the attempts to exclude them from the political process, representatives upholding democratic positions [words indistinct] and the first deputy chief editor—this is an attempt to make IZVESTIYA obedient and to offer material which is of no interest to readers. Clearly, Comrade Lukyanov does not have any interest in the prestige which the IZVESTIYA newspaper had won. There is a desire to remove unsuitability and create yet another obedient [word indistinct].

As you see, for a man of centrist views, I am struck by the fact that the supreme leadership of the country did not object when you were presenting the ideas of Ivan Polozkov, and when you were representing congresses of the communist parties adhering to Marxist positions. But when we stated that we would never agree with the center's position with regard to the Baltic region, the resentful reaction to Radio Rossii began to increase. The reaction to the speech by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet on Radio Rossii was particularly negative. The reaction to the speeches by deputies representing Russia's legislative body was as a rule particularly negative. The leadership cannot imagine that in this instance it is a question of state radio which is obliged to uphold the interests of the republic from the point of view of the government and from the point of view of the Supreme Soviet. This impermissible act, when the will of one person deprives a republic of its right to the free dissemination of information, we consider to be absurd, infringing upon the law on the press, and impermissible for a civilized state which speaks about defending human rights. What human rights, if one has to defend the rights of a whole republic? We believe that this wili lead to undesirable consequences. The government is studying the question of taking emergency measures in response,

for it places the decision of the leadership of the country into the emergency category. These measures are being worked out and will be adopted in the very near future. Thank you for your attention. [end recording]

Broadcasting Chiefs View Changes

LD0402234591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 2000 GMT on 4 February broadcasts a four-minute report on the Moscow press conference of the chiefs of All-Russian radio and tv. The report begins with the announcer briefly reminding listeners of the predicament faced by Radio Rossii. An unidentified speaker is then heard to say: One should add, perhaps, that the main blow has been dealt to television today. The Gosteleradio has carried out a thorough selection of television programs and television journalists. It has practically eliminated the "Vzglyad" program, introduced posts from the center to [word indistinct], the Television News Service, transferred the "Author's Television", and so on and so forth. I think that all of us who have worked in television and continue to do so, were all pleased with yesterday's demarche when the program "Arkadiy Arkanov and His Friends" was taken off the air at the demand of participants and authors of the program, since those people wish to have nothing in common with the leadership of the Gosteleradio. The statement by a group of culture figures in support of Russian television and in support of progressive forces at Central Television has started to play its role and is being implemented."

The film director Elem Klimov then speaks about the need for democratic forces to have a proper mouthpiece "to counter the stream of disinformation and lies which has again started flowing from television screens and certain media like in Brezhnev's times."

Another unidentified speaker speaks about the onslaught of reactionary forces which have decided to deprive democratic forces of any access to the media. Everyone's civic duty is to do everything possible to oppose a reactionary coup, he says. "The process of curtailing freedom of speech and glasnost continues," he says, "and therefore I have proposed to the leadership of [Russian] state television and radio, while defending their today's views and continuing to fight for Russian radio and television in a normal form, within the Republic of Russia, I have proposed that they should start thinking about setting up a radio service of their own abroad and to name that radio station sovereign or independent Russia. Given the ongoing events, this option cannot be ruled out," he concludes.

Editors Call for 'New Mass Media'

LD0302111791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Excerpts] A conference of editors in chief from Russian newspapers was held today in the so-called White House on Krasnopresnenskaya Naberezhnaya. [passage omitted]

A resolution has just arrived on our teletype machine. [passage omitted] I shall read the last two points in full:

While supporting the work of the Ministry of the Press and Mass Media in organizing and strengthening Russia's democratic press, we call on the government to devise a definite plan for the development of new mass media and to take charge of its implementation. We consider it our civic and professional duty to state our support for the Russian legislature and government and for their economic, political, and cultural work og reviving Russia's sovereignty and developing direct and mutually beneficial contacts with sovereign republics.

We call on all the mass media to provide objective, up-to-the-minute, and wide coverage of the work of the Russian legislature. We trust that all publications that hold dear the idea of freedom of the press will publish this resolution.

[Signed] The All-Russian Conference of Chief Editors of Russia's Newspapers

Commentary on Radio Restrictions

LD0302054591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1903 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Nikolay Agayants commentary]

[Text] Of all the reports from foreign press agencies that have reached us so far, pole position is almost occupied by the reports from Moscow that Radio Rossii has been deprived of its opportunity to broadcast on the First Program and on Mayak, as had been stipulated by an agreement with the heads of the USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio broadcasting] and as had been the case up till now. Stories on this were filed by correspondents from DPA, UP, KYODO, AFP, REUTER, and other well-known information services. It is being remarked that this move by the USSR Gosteleradio is yet another indication of the pressure being put upon Russian democrats by the conservative forces; and that it has been made if not with the direct approval of the president of the Soviet Union, then at the very least with his tacit consent.

REUTER correspondent Richard Balmforth believes that actions such as this will undoubtedly result in further difficulties between—on the one hand—the center, and on the other the Russian government and legislature generally; and more specifically between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. The general view of our foreign colleagues is that, notwithstanding all the Union leadership's much-vaunted declarations of its commitment to the ideas of democratization and glasnost, in the first place these are being trampled underfoot before our very eyes; and in the second place the international norms governing freedom of expression, freedom of choice, and the dissemination of information are being flouted.

In the course of the daytime editions of Radio Rossii, I have already spoken of this problem, recalling the Declaration on Human Rights and the final document of the Vienna meeting of countries participating in the (?European security conference). Unfortunately, it must be said that the heads of USSR Gostelradio have never heard of these accords which bear the signatures of Soviet plenipotentiaries, or else—and this is even worse—they do not give a bean for international law.

All this is very curious and does not really fit with the declarations from on high about pan-human values, the need to create a law-governed state in the USSR, and to build a common European home. I suppose I might be mistaken. Or perhaps the attempts to rein in Radio Rossii, to deprive its listeners of the opportunity to receive information on the First program and Mayak, and—should our Russian radio journalists dare to criticize the country's leadership—to refuse them broadcasting rights totally, perhaps this is in fact the promised democracy and glasnost! Alas, there are as yet no answers to all these questions.

Russian TV Chief Hopes for 31 Mar Start

LD0402235491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2140 GMT 4 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Correspondent Lashchenko] Here is the television news service in Ostankino. Our colleagues here are on the air with their program of Radio Rossii. At the same time, on Fifth Street in Yamskoye Field a press conference of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company is being held. Soviet and foreign correspondents are interested in the issues of broadcasting in a new regime. Now Radio Rossii is to be broadcast on the channel of Radio Two. The Russian company does not see any logic in this decision by the state television and radio administration, as only 40 percent of Russia's population can receive Radio Two. In connection with this, many foreign broadcasting companies have offered help—including the leasing of transmitters—to Radio Rossii. When shall we see Russian television on the screen?

[A.G. Lysenko, general director of the All-Russian Television and Radio Company] I would like it to begin on 31 March. We would like it to be television that is equally interesting to everyone who resides on the territory of our country, as it is not merely republican television. We are standing on the positions of pluralism, although we are being accused of one-sidedness. We believe that representatives of different views have the right to speak. It is up to the viewer to decide. It is a journalist's job to present views, and it is up to the television viewer to choose them, and not up to the journalist to do it for him.

Electronic 'Bugging' of Supreme Soviet Denied

PM0402220291 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 91 p 1

["Own information" report: "Parliamentary Bugging"]

[Text] It has become known to us that rooms in the Russian Supreme Soviet building on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment have been found to contain bugging equipment. This was confidentially reported to the building's security service by communications experts. According to information from the communications people, special equipment had been installed in rooms 420 and 420A (above B, Yeltsin's office), equipment which is used by USSR KGB workers. Yu. Goryachev, an employee of the Supreme Soviet security service, reported that these are "high security" rooms, and the Supreme Soviet house management services do not even have keys to them. The KGB staffers were issued with passes by former Council of Ministers Administrator of Affairs Sterlikov, who has now moved to a job in the USSR KGB apparatus.

Yu. Goryachev also reported that the equipment installed in these rooms has nothing to do with government communications, and now seems to "belong to nobody." Most likely, the doors of rooms 420 and 420a will be opened in the presence of deputies and their interiors shown to journalists.

Meanwhile...

A.N. Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, assured the editorial office that nothing of the kind exists in reality, and that in his opinion such things are simply impossible today.

Yeltsin Chairs Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium

PM0402155991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Feb 91 First Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Press Service report: "In the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] A routine sitting of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium was held at the RSFSR House of the Soviets 30 January. The sitting was chaired by B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

It examined and approved proposals regarding certain changes in the structure and composition of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. Specifically, it was decided to set up an RSFSR State Committee for Defense and Security and a State Committee for Housing and Utilities within the RSFSR Council of Ministers structure, and to form an RSFSR Ministry of Fuel and Power Generation.

The sitting approved the idea of an RSFSR Federation Council—a coordinating body, comprising the chairmen of the republics' supreme soviets, the chairmen of autonomous oblast and okrug soviets of people's deputies, and

the chairmen of kray, oblast, and Moscow City and Leningrad City soviets of people's deputies.

The procedure for implementing the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies 20 June 1990 resolution "On the Mechanism for People's Power in the RSFSR" was decided. The supreme soviets of republics within the RSFSR and local soviets of people's deputies have been instructed to ensure that this resolution's provision as regards the ban on combining the posts of soviet chairman with other posts in political and sociopolitical organizations is implemented by 15 March 1991.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium heard a report from G.G. Matyukhin, chairman of the RSFSR Central Bank, on the preliminary results of the exchange of 50- and 100-ruble bank notes on RSFSR territory.

Due to numerous inquiries lodged with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium regarding the well-known order issued by the USSR ministers of defense and of internal affairs, the Presidium has decided to submit a draft resolution for discussion by the Supreme Soviet session—a resolution that envisages proposing that the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee give its findings on the constitutionality of these acts, along with a request that the USSR president suspend the operation of the order until the Constitutional Oversight Committee produces its findings.

Other questions of state life in the RSFSR were also examined.

Shakhay Addresses Supreme Soviet 1 Feb

LD0202223791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2035 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Speech by Deputy Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakhray, chairman of the Committee for Legislation, on the draft decision on the USSR referendum, at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 1 February—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies and esteemed chairman: The tabled draft decision has two clear-cut parts. The first one is the RSFSR's attitude toward the Union's referendum. The second part raises the issue of the RSFSR's referendum. As to the Union's referendum, above all the question arises whether it is necessary to hold it on the territory of the RSFSR if the Congress of People's Deputies has already taken an identical unquivocal decision in favor of the RSFSR becoming part of the Union, of a renewed Union. The process, costing about 400 million rubles (R), of deciding on a matter which has already been decided prompts some questions, of course. It would have been better to spend the money on rehabilitating those subjected to repression. The Union would have only gained from this in strength and in general.

However, the referendum has been set up, and is formualted in terms which give rise to many questions. I shall remind you how it is formulated: Do you consider it necessary to preserve the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as as renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of the person of any nationality will be guaranteed in full?

In this formulation at least three problems, of differing nature and order, have been put forward. In this situation the expression of the will of the USSR peoples is not just being hampered, but is practically made impossible, because, judging by the results, the appropriate organs could attach their own content to this formula. Thus, in this situation there are three ways to act: First—not to carry out the Union referendum, because this question has been decided by Russia and the expression of the peoples' will is not possible under such formula. The second option is to carry out this referendum and thus avoid this issue. The third option is to carry out the Union referendum, and at the same time to bring the additional questions to the Russian referendum.

The first of the suggested options, namely, not to carry out the Union referendum, is not possible, in my view, in the moral and psychological atmosphere surrounding this question. The majority of Russian Federation citizens and RSFSR peoples' deputies support the idea of the necessity of the USSR's existence. It is also not possible because the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is being blocked on this given problem locally—by the autonomies and the oblasts. They will carry out the referendum because the Union law instructs that this question should be answered, the referendum conducted by the RSFSR republics.

It is also impossible to block the referendum, because the traditional accusations of dismantling the Union will follow straight away. Moreover, consider the logic of such accusations. The meanings are being replaced—the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR president are the Union; those who doubt their ability to govern effectively are being criticized for trying to dismantle the Union. One should not be governed by such logic, because it leads away from the essence of the problem. Russia, while attempting to conclude truly voluntary and equal treaties with other republics, does not dismantle the Union, but preserves it by actually renewing it. The attempts to keep the Union under the banner of preserving the old structures and putting them out of the reach of criticism is actually its dismantling.

Therefore, in my view the conclusion is this: It is not possible to block the Union referendum. This is impossible. Secondly, in my view the third way is optimal. Because the voting will take place anyway on 17 March, it is reasonable to use the referendum to solve long standing Russian problems; namely, the problem of the national and state structure of the Russia itself, its position in the renewed Union, and what sort of Union this will be.

The second problem—a reorganization of the system of state bodies upon the introduction of the post of RSFSR

president. In accordance with the RSFSR Constitution, there are only three cases when the RSFSR Supreme Soviet must announce a referendum—I stress the word must. The first case stipulates a direct instruction by a Congress of People's Deputies. The second case stipulates a demand by 1 million electors. The third case stipulates a demand by one-third of the RSFSR people's deputies.

Today we have—the Presidium has witnessed the signatures of people's deputies—we have a demand by one-third of the RSFSR people's deputies. I will remind you that this means at least 355 deputies. Incidentally, there are 34 million electors, citizens of the Russian Federation, behind this figure.

Having received such a demand, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet may choose one of three modes of action, in compliance with our law. First, to adopt, by itself, the decision put to a referendum. Second, not to announce a referendum if the law has been violated, if the procedure for revealing the will of the people's deputies has been violated. The third option is to announce a referendum and to solve the organizational issues of preparing it.

The first option is impossible for the Supreme Soviet, since the adoption of decisions on issues put to a referendum is subject to constitutional regulation, and the Supreme Soviet does not possess such rights. The second option, that is, a violation of the law and, in connection with this, failure to announce a referendum, is unfounded; there are no grounds for that, since the signatures of all deputies have been witnessed. So the third option remains, and in accordance with the Constitution, we must adopt such a decision.

On formulations: The wording about the president is clear and as laconic as possible. You have the draft decision before you. Do you support the introduction of the post of RSFSR president elected by nationwide ballot? The second wording—there are clarifications here: Do you consider necessary the preservation of the RSFSR as a sovereign federative state which makes part of a Union of sovereign republics on a voluntary and equal basis? Some words should be said about the second wording. There are two facets here. The first is Russia's national-state structure as such. The processes of decay have permeated, or encompassed, not only the Union republics but, unfortunately, the Russian Federation, too.

Here we must clarify this issue. Whatever decision we discuss, we constantly face the question of what the Russian Federation is and who is part of it. The need became pressing a long time ago. The second angle is the Union structure. As for the first angle, I would like to stress resolutely that the status of autonomous states, republics, and formations within the RSFSR is determined by them themselves, which means that it can increase. The Supreme Soviet deputies, or even the Congress, have no right to submit this issue to referendum.

Well, and as for secession from the USSR and direct joining of the USSR, three conditions ought to be fufilled, and a certain procedure should be observed. The first condition is the will of the people of the given republic. It is expressed either by the republic's Supreme Soviet or its referendum. The second condition is a decision of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies which legalizes and supports such an initiative. The third condition is the fact that other Union republics forming the USSR express their will voluntarily, accepting a new equal subject to join their family.

There is no doubt that the order and procedures of secession from the USSR should be observed in order to solve economic problems, problems of citizenship, and the whole range of other problems which arise due to the fact that the fates of these people and republics are intertwined. There should be no other obstacles. They are not constitutional. But these should be—I am deeply convinced, and as a lawyer I am responsible for my words—should be observed. Ultimately, those very deputies, including USSR people's deputies, who at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and at the Supreme Soviet have been delivering well-justified and enthusiastic speeches in favor of asking the people themselves, cannot oppose the idea that the destiny of the centuries-old state of Russia be decided by the people of this state themselves. At the same time, it is obvious that the results of a referendum should be summed up by each republic of the RSFSR separately. In that case, it won't be possible to blame the Supreme Soviets for deciding the fate of people against their will.

The second angle of the given formulation is very important, for it answers the question of what the USSR should be like. To be exact, it should be a Union of sovereign republics, and should execute two main principles of any federation. I would like to make my own position clear. I support a federation, but not a confederation. Relations within a confederation—because I think that a federation ought to be an open one—can possibly form a stage of transition from one status to another. Here there are two main principles of a federation: voluntary and equal unification. An attempt to force the creation of the Union will lead to it sooner or later decomposing or being torn apart by its own contradictions.

The third thing... [shout from the floor: "Finish your speech!"] I am finishing. The content of issues which the Supreme Soviet must tackle in connection with holding a Union referendum and announcing a Russian one are reflected in a draft which has been brought to your attention. Only one point should be added to it. This point was delivered to you. The matter is that while organizing and carrying out voting and its supervision, one should be guided by Articles 6, 25, and 28-34 of the RSFSR Law on Referendum. I mean the organization of voting and really effective measures undertaken by electors, public organizations, and parties to control the trustworthiness of voting.

Another thing: Yes, we should include in the proposed decision a point about the fact that, in accordance with the decision by the Central Electoral Commission, several issues submitted for the All- Russian referendum may be included on the ballot papers. This may be accounted for by the acute shortage of paper and printing resources, and other such problems. The Central Electoral Commission is being given the right to resolve this problem, having studied the issue, and to include two issues on the ballot paper, for example.

The last point—other proposals on the Russian referendum. There are some. In particular, they were distributed to you and they deserve attention. In connection with this, it should be explained that the Supreme Soviet itself does not have the right to submit any kind of issue for referendum by its own decision. It was deprived of this right by the Congress when it adopted amendments to the Constitution. But if the signatures of one million voters or of one-third of RSFSR people's deputies are collected, the Supreme Soviet will be obliged to do this—but this will already be another decision. Thank you for your attention.

Yeltsin Appeals to Russians in Baltics

PM0102153391 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 15 Jan 91 p 1

[Undated appeal by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin: "Boris Yeltsin: I Appeal for Prudence"]

[Text] Allow me to address the Russian-speaking population living in the Baltic region: the Lithuanian Republic, the Latvian Republic, and the Estonian Republic!

Today events are developing very rapidly, and they cannot fail to alarm othe as well as us; they also disturb the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and the peoples of Russia. The other day the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a special statement on events in the Baltic republics which condemned those actions which are unlawful to law and do not conform either to the Russian Federation's adopted laws or the laws adopted by the Baltic republics' Supreme Soviets. Yesterday we signed a treaty with the Estonian Republic. The treaty is all-embracing. It is a treaty which recognizes each other's sovereignty. A treaty which determines our relations for many years—for the next 10 years to be precise. A treaty which determines the principles of mutual relations between us in all spheres of life and work, economics, scientific and technical progress, culture, science, interethnic relations, language, citizenship, etc. A special protocol to the treaty is the one signed which states that a special program on protecting by all possible means the Russian-speaking population and its rights on Estonian soil and Estonians on Russian soil is now being worked out and will be specially signed. We are thinking over similar treaties and have already agreed to sign one with the Latvian Republic. This treaty will be signed today and a treaty with the Lithuanian Republic will be signed in a few days, as soon as the situation there returns to normal. And I appeal to the Russian-speaking population for peace and calm so that problems can be solved by means of talks and we can sit down at a "round table" and resolve disputed problems not by coming to blows but by logic and common sense, so that you can live in this land and work in this land in the name of your children, in the name of citizens living on the territory of these republics, in the name of Russia, and in the name of the whole Union. This treaty now gives us the legal basis and rights to enter into any kind of lawful contacts based on international law should undesirable situations arise in mutual relations with the Russian-speaking population here or with the Estonian population on Russian soil, specifically on a legal basis. Therefore such a treaty is not a deviation, it is not a betrayal—as some people try to lecture Russia in front of the Russian-speaking population living in these territories—but quite the reverse: It is a legal protection, it is a document which gives us a basis for protecting the Russian-speaking population in a really practical way, should any undesirable excesses occur. So once again I appeal for peace, I appeal for talks, and I appeal for normal working, since these treaties open up great possibilities for the consistent horizontal ties between enterprises, organizations, etc. which have been formed for many, many years now and which are actually the basis of these collectives' work today; if these ties are not present, if these ties are severed, then it will be difficult for many thousands of families in the Baltic republics, here on this soil, and in Russia.

Once again I appeal to you for prudence.

Moscow Center Takes Poll on Army Patrols

LD0302145291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Feb 91

[Text] Joint militia and Army patrols have again taken to the streets of Moscow. The Moscow division of the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion undertook a straw poll on this subject on 31 January in Moscow. The results are as follows:

In reply to the question: Do you think the crime situation in Moscow warants the Army being put on patrol duties? Yes, 35 percent; no, 52 percent; and 13 percent found difficulty answering.

As to whether the patrols would prevent mass rallies and demonstrations being held in Moscow, the opinions were: Yes, 58 percent; no, 28 percent; and again, 13 percent had difficulty answering.

Soviet Protests Delay in Komissarov Post

LD0402221391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] This evening the chairman of the Commission for Legality, Law and Order, and the Protection of Citizens'

Rights of the Moscow City Soviet conveyed to us the text of the commission's decision, asking us to familiarize you, esteemed comrades, with its content. The document that has been adopted touches on the confusions connected with Militia Major General Komissarov's appointment as head of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee. The thing is that more than two months have passed since his nomination was discussed, and this time is quite sufficient for any coordination. However, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] displays an unadmissible procrastination with issuing the relevant order. Meanwhile, Lieutenant General Bogdanov illegally holds the post of head of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee; he was dismissed from this post at a session of the Moscow City Soviet.

The Standing Commission for Legality, Law and Order and the Protection of Citizens' Rights regards the actions of the Union MVD as an attempt to make that situation in the city, which is complex enough, even more complicated. The commission draws the attention of the USSR MVD that the delay in placing militia Major General Komissarov in office disorganize the running of Moscow militia subunits, weakens the personnel's discipline, and entails other negative consequences caused by absence of a management.

Western Republics

Official Assured of Ukraine Continuing in UN

LD0202143191 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 2 Feb 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Alexey Trotsenko]

[Text] Kiev February 2 TASS—Therese Paquet-Sevigny, U.N. under-secretary-general for public information, described her trip to the Ukraine as interesting and useful. She met republican Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Komisarenko and foreign minister Anatoliy Zlenko. They discussed the Ukraine's participation in the United Nations' activity.

Paquet-Sevigny said that in the U.N. they always felt the Ukraine's involvement in all areas of the organisation's work: disarmament, security, efforts to dismantle racism, apartheid and in solving important social problems.

She thinks that the policy of openness and broad information of the public about the republic's life, which is pursued by the Ukrainian U.N. mission and the republican foreign ministry, helps the Ukraine permanently to increase the number of its friends in the world. Paquet-Savigny said they would help the republic successfully to overcome the existing difficulties. This also applies to the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, she said.

Zlenko assured Paquet-Sevigny that the Ukraine intended to remain an active U.N. member in the future as well.

Paquet-Sevigny spoke to the Kiev public, activists of the Ukraine's U.N. association, lecturers and students of Kiev university.

The guest capped her stay in the capital of the Ukraine by a meeting with Soviet and foreign journalists.

U.N. Information Centre in Moscow director Boiko Tarabanov, who accompanied the guest in her trip, took part in the meeting.

Paquet-Sevigny left Kiev for Brussels this morning.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Agenda Viewed

PM0402084591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Sergey Tsikora from the "Direct Line" column: "The Future of the Ukraine Is on the Agenda"]

[Text] Kiev—A session of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has opened in Kiev. Parliamentarians are to define the future of the Ukraine in both the political and economic spheres.

At news conferences preceding the opening of the session, journalists learned that a number of drafts of the republic's new Constitution have been compiled, including drafts which orient society toward building socialism further, and those which categorically reject it. The Union Treaty is just as controversial. The latest sociological polls conducted in the republic have revealed that many Ukraine inhabitants favor defining their attitude toward the Union treaty after the republic has acquired genuine sovereignty.

A fundamental step for the Ukraine also will be the planned establishment of a national bank with its own credit resources. This question is among the priority issues to be discussed at the currrent session. The Ukrainian SSR has signed economic contracts with all the Union republics. The volume of mutual deliveries of output under the contracts run into tens of billions of rubles. The Ukraine believes it can no longer manage without its own national bank. Having concluded these contracts, the Ukraine also is graphically demonstrating its commitment to developing horizontal ties as the fundamental principle of the economy of the future union. The upcoming referendums and the approval of their results will clearly turn into a genuine test for the republic. The inhabitants of the Ukraine will have to define their attitude toward the preservation of the Union and their confidence in the current composition of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet... No less effort will be needed to adopt decisions on ownership and on the Chernobyl problem. Without the solution of the question of ownership cardinal economic reform is not feasible. And without the finalization of all the details

pertaining to the Chernobyl tragedy, normal life of the greater part of the Ukrainian population is unthinkable.

Chernobyl AES Explosion Rumors Quelled

914A0387A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 30 Jan 91 p 4

[Report by correspondent Georgiy Dolzhenko: "But the City Thought About It... Instead of Explaining What Happened When the People of Kiev Were Having Their Days Off"]

[Text] Kiev—At 0200 the alarm sounded. An agitated voice reported that they were saying that something had happened at Chernobyl.

I was unable to get a telephone call through to any of the reception offices of the chiefs. About an hour later there was more news: A dam had burst at Chernobyl and radionuclides might get into the water pipeline. It must be admitted that, of course, we filled the bath tub and other containers. It turned out that during the latter part of the night almost all the people of Kiev were doing the same thing.

At first it was thought that the reason for all the commotion was explosions that had occurred that evening above the Pripyat River in the Chernobyl area. People allegedly heard them, and that was all. Later the situation became somewhat more clear. Ice hummocks and ice blockage had formed in the mouth of the Pripyat. The water started to build up. There was a danger that it might reach contaminated tracts of land and wash the soil into the Dnepr. So military aviators were called in to bomb the blockage. And that, they said, was what the explosions were.

However, the first reports from the announcers were so vague that the people of Kiev were even more on the alert. Not believing the official assurances from the authorities, people began to think about the situation for themselves: they said that the pilots had "missed" and slewed about who knows where, and perhaps radioactive substances had still been washed into the water, and they were covering it up. Or the bombs had lifted radioactive mud from the bottom and it had fallen into the water intakes. In any event, no one was in any hurry to empty his bath tub. It was only toward evening, after numerous explanations, that the tension died down. The curious incident might have ended there had it not been for yet another "but" which totally changed the situation.

"There were no explosions that evening," the secretary of the Ukrainian government commission for emergency situations, V. Potikh, told me to my amazement. "The dangerous situation in the mouth of the Pripyat, when the water level rose one meter or more, was observed four days ago. It was then that the aviation was called in, and it bombed the ice. But none of the explosions caused any panic. It also used to be done before the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. Everything is now normal there. In my opinion, it was a planned provocation."

I looked at a calendar. It was true. A meeting had been planned for the Saturday to mark the 73d anniversary of the January uprising, as the encyclopedia puts, it "of the workers and soldiers against the central authorities." And I had indeed seen that meeting on the Saturday morning in the park across from the Mariynskiy Palace. But who had raised his hand to play on the sacred feelings of the people of Kiev to reopen the bleeding wounds of Chernobyl for the sake of some political aim of the moment? And who is strong enough to bring a city of 3 million to its feet in the middle of the night?

However, I shall not try to invent things about the situation. The legal government has competent organs to check all the versions. It is something else that disturbs me. Neither the government institutions or other institutions slept the entire night. The purpose of what happened was obviously clear right from the start. Was it really so difficult to gather together by the morning clear and truthful information so as to put an end to the concerns of the city's inhabitants?

Lvov Communist Secretary on Party in Opposition

91UN0806A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 2

[Interview with V. Sekretaryuk, first secretary of the Lvov Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, by Viktor Yurlov; place, date not given: "Yesterday in Office, Today in Opposition"]

[Text] *As is known, the leaders of the new political parties and nationalist movements of Western Ukraine are setting as the "modest" task the banning and dissolving of the CPSU. Everything would be alright, but the trouble is that the people are in no hurry to comply with the new chiefs' extremist appeals. Nonetheless, the situation there is extremely tense, and the confrontation of political forces threatens a direct disruption of civil peace. Communists do not stand idly by. But my interviewee is smartly dressed, animated and sharp.*

[Yurlov] How do you feel, Vyacheslav Vasilyevich?

[Sekretaryuk] Fine, thank you. What, do I look bad?

[Yurlov] On the contrary. Looking at you, one would not think that just a couple of days ago people were shouting "shame" and "out" [both words rendered in Ukrainian] at you. And, as far as I know, there are only 32 communists among the 200 deputies in the oblast soviet. Members of the CPSU are in the minority also in the Lvov City Soviet and in the majority of the oblast's rayon soviets.

[Sekretaryuk] Yes, and this is the uniqueness of the situation. On the one hand the oblast party organization is on the political level in opposition. On the other, we

are a detachment of the governing party of the Ukraine. Communists constitute the majority in the Supreme Soviet. So it is not all that bad.

[Yurlov] Being out of office is a new and unusual experience for the communists. How have you survived?

[Sekretaryuk] I understand your sarcasm, but—we have survived. And whereas last April even our opponents were predicting the swift demise of the entire party structure and many communists quailed and quit the party, the situation is now changing. Some 200 persons have applied to join the party recently. Can you see what is happening?

[Yurlov] Not really, to be honest. We have been fed and fed....

[Sekretaryuk] I will explain. Our opponents in the Lvov region decided to conduct a unique historical experiment—to build anticommunism in one individual oblast. Just as, you see, we communists had tried to build socialism in one individual country, so attempts are now being made to once again resurrect the same, but with the opposite political sign.

I cannot speak for the whole country but in the Western Ukraine the appearance of anticommunism on the political stage is a fact of real life.

It is said that the active members of Rukh run into the tens of thousands and that the movement is supported by 14 parties. All very well. Are we to be the 15th party in that case? What is the difference between us? Just this: There remain, following all the perturbations in the oblast party organization, approximately 90,000 active members, who have not been frightened by any threats and who are continuing to proudly bear the name of communist.

We are not standing on ceremony and do not lay claim to any special role. Our desire—to be among the other political forces in the struggle for democratic transformations and to be part of the political mosaic—evokes only a reaction of rejection among democrats. True, it is they who call themselves "democrats," we, however, call them more accurately anticommunists.

Thus the forces which have now united in struggle against the communists are practically a bloc of all 14 parties. The basis of their aspirations is the struggle for a monopoly of power—such is the logic of political struggle. To remove us and gain a monopoly. What is happening essentially is what the Communist Party formerly came up with, when it united both political and command functions. We have already gone through this.

[Yurlov] But you, Vyacheslav Vasilyevich, do not deny the obvious fact that the new authorities in the Lvov region were elected democratically, for the first time in the history of the region, perhaps. But you are virtually depriving the people's elect of the right to express the people's interests.

[Sekretaryuk] Such a way of presenting the issue contains a mistake, which, incidentally, is constantly being made—intentionally at times, it would seem—by the anticommunists also. They obtained the support not of the whole people but only part of them.

To what the abrupt, politicized form of government leads may be seen perfectly distinctly today even. To the division of the people! However dreadful the command-administrative system, even it did not manage to divide the people. The "democrats" have accomplished this task brilliantly. And when the people are split, the best ideas of legislators founder on the confrontational enmity of the political forces.

Let us go back to April, when the elections were over. New democratic forces of the Lvov region, which had made their presence felt loudly and promisingly, had come front-stage politically at that time. The principles of national revival which they were propagandizing and a new attitude toward religion and the blanks in the history of the people aroused great euphoria in the oblast. To be honest, I also succumbed to the fine phrases initially. As though new authorities would emerge and declare the Lvov region an island of freedom!

But how far the high-sounding slogans proved to be from subsequent practice. Just one example of how the tragic pages of the people's history have been used to incite anticommunist hysteria. Many human remains were discovered during excavations in the former jail house of the small town of Drogobych. The "democrats" immediately announced that this was the work of the communists. The trouble was that there was no room for any other viewpoint. And we then demanded the formation of a government commission. The commission came, and an investigation began. And what transpired? Under the Germans the Gestapo had ruled the roost in Drogobych, and prior to this there had been a Polish prison here, and only afterward did NKVD officers arrive here as the "masters." And without having looked into what was what, thousands of people who visited the excavations went away with the firm belief that, yes, all this was done by the communists.

[Yurlov] Not a nice story, there's no denying. Do not take offense, but I will give you my view of what is happening. You are being treated this way, evidently, not only because there is a certain anticommunist mood but primarily because for the whole time the communists did not fittingly rebuff their opponents' "fantasies." Not once, anywhere! And the initiative immediately came to be with the enemy.

[Sekretaryuk] You are probably right. But we are emerging from the trenches and, I would say even, have emerged. The turning point was observed last fall. We learned that on 14 September the city soviet, with the consent of the oblast soviet, would be adopting a decision on dismantling the monument to Lenin in Lvov. And on 13 September we organized a Lenin Monument

Defense Committee. The committee appealed to all public organizations to stage a protest meeting. The voice of the communists was heard. Approximately 15,000 persons made their way to the monument. And? The municipal authorities adopted a decision to hold a parallel meeting at the very same spot. You can imagine what happened. The confrontation of two vast crowds assumed an ominous nature. A match tossed into it, seemingly, and—conflagration. We communists were greatly concerned that there not be such a match. In short, the meetings did not take place. But the true character of the authorities was revealed at that time from a new angle which came as a surprise to many people (but not to us).

What happened stirred up the entire community of the Lvov region. How so? We are speaking, people reflected, about freedom and pluralism, but when one part of the people dares to have its own viewpoint, it is suppressed. But this is a manifest sign of totalitarianism.

Such events snowballed. A month later, in October, in the city of Stryy, the authorities organized the picketing of the building of the Communist Party of the Ukraine gorkom [city party committee]. Calls for the gorkom to be stormed and for an end to be put to the communists were heard. The communists stood firm before the threats and continued to defend themselves. The "democrats" then nailed up all the doors of the gorkom from outside so that, in the event of an exacerbation of the situation, no one could leave. Then they turned off the power.... The struggle went on for two days. We appealed for help to the republic authorities. Thank God, power in the Ukraine is Soviet. We were helped. But approximately 3,000 communists quit the party. People had been intimidated.

[Yurlov] And what was the workers' attitude toward this?

[Sekretaryuk] The workers differ also. Many believed the "democrats'" fine words, and many continue to support them still. But far from all! We are today fighting for each individual. We already have instances of people beginning to return to the party. And whereas everyone was saying in April that such a structure as the Communist Party would disappear from the political scene in the Lvov region, everyone can see today that it not only has not disappeared but has strengthened even further.

I would like to tell you that force will solve nothing in the Lvov region now. Now, when the euphoria from the promises of the leaders of Rukh has passed, the people have begun to waver. Nor did the year's lamentable socioeconomic conclusion, of course, help to reinforce their authority. There has been a sharp decline in the living standard in the oblast. Lvov people now have it worst in the Ukraine. We have the highest prices at the markets. And it is not only a question of there being a general decline in the economy in the country, which the authorities are mentioning over and over. But also that there are in the leadership people who do not know how to dispose of this power. They are good at fighting the communists, but how to help a sick economy, how to improve the construction of housing, schools, kindergarten, creches—at this they are weak. All that they could mess up, they have messed up. They summed up the results—the situation is catastrophic. They began investigations, and it is not the center which is to blame for the majority of misfirings and failures but themselves. Their own incompetence. References to the center are the ploys of those who do not know how to work.

[Yurlov] Struggle is struggle, but we should not, probably, forget the old Ukrainian saying: When the masters sneeze, the servants catch cold. What is the good of a victory for the democrats or the communists if this is pyrrhic? If as a result people's lives become even worse?

[Sekretaryuk] I agree. What is the communists' plan of action? First, there should in the oblast be a strong party organization to balance the other political forces. Second, we will not permit actions like desecration of the memory of Lenin to spread unchecked. We will evaluate them immediately and stir up public opinion. We have learned this. We will show the groundlessness of the anticommunist forces not simply in words but in practice: We will offer specific programs economic primarily, pertaining to a way out of the crisis.

And the third direction, as I see it. We communists recognize the authorities elected by the people. And will look for ways to cooperate with them. On economic issues, naturally.

[Yurlov] Nonetheless, let us suppose that the situation in the Lvov region heats up to such an extent that a national salvation committee is formed. Whose side would the obkom be on?

[Sekretaryuk] The obkom would be on the side of the law. And the law says that there can be no parallel power structures in the Ukraine. And that is that.

But I understand the underlying implication in your question. You have surely heard that this matter—a committee for social harmony—is already being discussed in the Lvov region. But it is not the communists who are the initiators here. However paradoxical, the authors of this proposal are... the legitimate authorities. A session of the oblast soviet adopted this decision, and representatives of the Communist Party and the army were not included on the committee, what is more. The chairman of this parallel structure is... the chairman of the oblast soviet, and with special powers, what is more. But here in the Ukraine we have, I repeat, Soviet power. And everyone should be subordinate to it. The leaders of Lvov Oblast included.

I would like to draw an analogy with Lithuania here. There is much in common in the development of events in both places. And not fortuitously. Until recently, incidentally, emissaries from Lithuania were constantly in the Lvov area, giving lessons in how democrats should

act in the struggle against the center for their sovereignty, how to boycott its decisions, and how to bring down the existing structures.

So I believe that it is primarily the republic leadership which is to blame for the tragedy which occurred in Lithuania. If you have taken it upon yourself to lead the peoples living on your territory, you must by all means tackle first of all the most important task—preventing the peoples falling out. Then tackle the second task: Organize relations with your neighbors so that the implementation of your ideas not be reflected in their general condition. And the third task: relations with the center. To use its existence not to incite hatred but to improve the lives of people of all nationalities and for further democratization. In Lithuania all these three principles were violated. I fear that with us also not everything is as good here as we might wish. So it transpires: People cannot fix things at home, but hasten to teach others.

[Yurlov] How do you, Vyacheslav Vasilyevich, view the immediate future?

[Sekretaryuk] With optimism. Constructing any forecasts otherwise is pointless. Adding to the reasons for optimism is also the fact that trust in the oblast party organization is being restored increasingly in the work force.

Newspaper Assesses Ukrainian Student Movement

91UN0805A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 2

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents K. Belyaninov, O. Musafirova, and S. Sokolov: "The 'Crusade' of the Children; An Epilogue to the 1990 Model of the Student Movement"]

[Text] Kiev—For some reason the warrant officer controller fiddled with the keys for a long time as he picked at the old rusty lock, cursing the lazy prison locksmiths under his breath.

"Well, that's got it," he finally reported, thrusting open the thick, iron-bound door. "Come in..."

And he offered a slight push in the back.

But the room was not so strange. It was for six people, with plank beds and mattresses. True, they were dirty and without sheets, but nevertheless nothing like the oubliettes of Petropavlovka that were so popular at one time with the revolutionary raznochinets [a class of 19th century intellectuals]. Inside the room they were seated: a thief, a currency smuggler, a citizen who inflicted grievous bodily harm on someone, a racketeer, and a mugger. The sixth, now brought in, was a student.

This criminal society assessed the newcomer immediately: After making his greetings and not saying much in response to the questions about his past petty crimes, the student sat himself on a plank bed and brought out a thick textbook from somewhere. He explained only that he had passed an examination that morning and had not been expecting to be kept in any room. And he buried himself in his "History of Economic Studies." "A political": The room had decided what he was.

No concise course on the history of the Ukrainian Student Union [USS] has yet been written, although students at the Kiev Pedagogical Institute have started to study the organizational experience of the Ukrainian Student Union, and on a quite official basis.

The most celebrated event in the history of the Ukrainian Student Union was the 15-day hunger strike in Kiev, which started on 2 October on the wave of a quite "adult" demonstration many thousands strong. Students set up a tent city in Independence Square (its official name is October Revolution Square). Their main demands were the resignation of the republic's premier, V. Masol, dissolution of the parliament, and new elections on a multiparty basis, nationalization of CPSU and VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] property, army service only on the territory of the Ukraine, and a boycott of the Union treaty.

Its result: On 16 October a conciliation commission of deputies was set up and the premier resigned. On the same day criminal cases were instituted by the city procurator's office "with respect to facts concerning the seizure of state institutions."

On the third day following his arrest Oles Doniy, a student in the fifth course of the history faculty at Kiev University and a Ukrainian Student Union leader himself, learned that he had become a "symptom." It was announced on the radio: "He has become a new symptom showing that the republic leadership has moved to the right"; it also added that representatives of all democratic forces in the Ukraine were watching the fate of Doniy "with alarm and hope." For Oles himself, however, it turned out that his future was of more concern to the investigator of the city procurator's office.

Although it is probable that even Doniy himself helped the investigation to "unmask" him. First, he always turned up right on time for interrogations, and he even turned up on time for the fifth and final one. Even though his "buddy" Dmitriy Miroshnichenko had been threatened with arrest earlier in the day. And second...

The case of the seizure of the Red Building at the university by striking students moved creakily. The hindrance was an article in the Ukrainian Constitution—Article 187, Clause 5 "seizure of state and public buildings for the purpose of making improper use of them." This article had appeared in the code only two years earlier and had not been applied during that time. There was also hindrance because of the public response to the hunger strike, whose participants had become little short of national heroes. For even the head of the republic Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, had publicly stated that none of those involved in the hunger strike would be held liable.

But the case did exist, and the republic procurator asked almost daily how things were going, and the investigators were in despair as they interrogated frightened first-year students who had absolutely nothing to do with the Ukrainian Student Union and had just happened to be in the Red Building that day. Finally, the city procurator, Viktor Shevchenko, visited the university personally and gathered together the students, who had now ended the strike, and asked what at first blush seemed to be a rhetorical question: "Who is guilty?"

And here, Doniy stood up and announced that he would assume all responsibility.

The procurator's office could have wished for nothing better. The recognized leader of the Ukrainian Student Union, one of the first people in the Ukrainian student movement! The organizer of the hunger strike, Kravchuk's chief opponent, who had argued himself hoarse on that square in October and succeeded in making a statement about student demands both on republic television and from the dais of the republic Supreme Soviet. Doniy was perfect for working up a story about an extremist group: At one time he had been selected to go on a Komsomol organizers' course but had pointedly quit the cohesive ranks of the VLKSM.

And, to the point, it was precisely with help from Doniy that a chain had been forged that the law enforcement agencies could in no way detect, namely the Ukrainian Student Union-Rukh chain. And it was shown rather simply that the Ukrainian Student Union was merely carrying out instructions issued by the "adults." For, although not a member of Rukh, Oles was a man who was extremely popular after the October hunger strike, and unexpectedly for himself had been elected to the Central Provod [Ukrainian for leadership]—the leading organ of the Ukrainian people's movement, as chief of the youth section. So that the procurator's office did not have to look far for the numerous public statements that the Ukrainian Student Union was an independent organization and under no one's control. It did not get to that. The case was opened.

We sat in the university dining hall engaged in friendly struggle with the cutlets. The cutlets fought to the death. However, Taras Kirpalo, the former commandant of the student tent city, dealt with his in just three minutes. But we...

"And so, even though you had assurances from the procurator's office, you sustained 13,000 rubles [R] of material damage in this dining hall?"

"It was R12,600." Taras clarified the point.

But the university vice-chancellor, Viktor Vasilyevich Skopenko, with an attitude of mistrust, to say the least, regarding Taras' monetary statistics, said this:

"The devil only knows what happened when these occupiers burst into the building. So that, apart from the dining hall, you can also add damages for the enforced absence of teachers and idle time for laboratories; it comes to R67,060 all told!

The facts show that the idea of barricading themselves within the university walls occurred to some lucid mind quite unexpectedly. We even have doubts that this head had at any time heard that this was exactly how French students had acted in a very revolutionary way in 1968. But be that as it may, half an hour after hundreds of students forced their way into the Red Building, all the doors had been blocked with cabinets, and the fire hoses had been unrolled in the corridors, against the special purpose militia detachment. But after tearing down a marker with the inscription "party committee" and smashing a plaster bust on the floor, the largest and most active part of the demonstrators considered their mission completed. Only those who understood that ripping down the marker with the "party committee" inscription on it was not the main thing were left in the building, and they were the only ones who remained there. Not in order ultimately to take over the university. The blockade of the building was the last means left to the students to remind the parliament of their demands.

Before 0230 Tanya Kutenko had made a list of the "population" of the Red Building. Many of the students still keep as souvenirs the pieces of paper torn from a school exercise book—their passes into the building. And those passes were issued for 90 people.

And of course, the elements of a crime can be found in their actions by ascribing everything to "incitement to hooliganism," as the city procurator's office is now trying to do. And if we take the text itself of Article 187, it is possible to call students who stand up for their own political demands, common criminals. But... the members of the university council turned their meeting into a political meeting and gave their total support to the student demands. That same vice-chancellor (because those stormy events involved people) removed from his own office the well-wishers who had proposed ejecting the strikers from the building by force. And his promise to respect the council decision to ask the prosecutor's office to close the criminal case was fulfilled. And although he was unrestrained in what he said, the report compiled at the request of the procurator's office, scrupulously accounting for every kopek, still stated that "Property is safe and the building has not been damaged."

But what meaning all of this can have for the procurator's office!

"We are not politicians," we were told by Stepan Vasilyevich Latyuk, the Kiev deputy procurator for investigations. "There is an act that is liable to criminal penalty, and we will punish it."

The time of paradox is now apparently reaching apogee. If anyone had stated during the time of those events in October that the students were on a hunger strike on instructions from "foreign subversive centers" it would

have done nothing but raise a laugh. But now the republic procurator, M. Potebenko, has told us this in a television interview, totally disregarding the confidential nature of the investigation. Similar charges, among other things, were leveled at Doniy even before his arrest and during the initial interrogations. And on the search warrant for Oles' apartment, it was written there in black and white: "The search is to be carried out for the purpose of finding weapons, illegal literature, and megaphones." So that a small sum of money found in an envelope with a foreign postmark and confiscated during the search can be used as the final piece of evidence. And the investigator's verdict will be irrefutable: Doniy is an agent of the CIA.

Even two months ago this would have been laughable. Just as the list of the literature removed during the search and declared illegal is laughable and absurd: Several copies of an ordinary rayon newspaper—SHLYAKH PEREMOGI—an issue of VESTNIK RUKHA, and so forth. Who knows how these will be regarded in six months? But the interrogations lasting four or five hours, the handcuffs, the four- man militia escort—these are the realities of today.

When Oles arrived at the republic procurator's office for the most crucial interrogation, a sergeant snapped on handcuffs and tied Doniy to the door of a vehicle. Just to be sure.

But Mikhail Alekseyevich Potebenko was strict, like a father. He had no intention of talking about the hunger strike, for the students still had an unbeatable trump card—the statement issued by the Supreme Soviet chairman to the effect that no one would be punished for that. So Mikhail Alekseyevich limited himself to reminding Doniy of the class that had reared and cared for him. And then the procurator read Oles' entrance examination piece for the university, written five years before. The procurator stopped at the appropriate place and raised a finger filled with significance: Five years later the law enforcement organs had found a error! A grammatical error!

And in general, with this the interrogation ended. In the face of such irrefutable charges, they offered Oles an ordinary deal: You write a letter of confession and we will let you go. Two pages of text, that's all.

Vladimir Nikolayevich Grinev, the deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, was perhaps the only person whom both radicals and conservatives suggested we approach. A doctor of sciences, a convinced centrist who has nevertheless managed to gain considerable authority in the internal political struggle in the republic parliament.

"Notwithstanding, the hunger strike became more of a means to exert psychological influence," he claims. "It enabled the politicians to better clarify for themselves their own political partialities but did not influence the balance of forces in the republic." But as a result nothing was done, not counting, of course, the resignation of the chairman of the Council of Ministers. Psychologically it really was the strongest demand made by the hunger strikers, But in reality... If the students had talked about the resignation of all the members of the old government it would have been logical and sensible. For it was not a question of the figure of Masol but rather the structure of the government and the ideological base on which it worked.

Today it is simply that a conservative upswing has started. They have been expecting it for a long time, but without taking any specific steps, but now the signal has evidently been given. There is a wave. On the one hand the new democratic structures are being strongly discredited, and are sometimes even discrediting themselves. On the other hand, the forces that do exist and, as before, are in the hands of that same Communist Party—the law enforcement agencies, for example—are being brought into play. Democratic ideas are being discredited. The hope, I think, is only that the partocracy does not have a constructive program. It has now gone over to the offensive, subordinating itself to the instinct of self-preservation. Nothing more. And it really will become a party that defends its own values and ideas. Unfortunately, however, the struggle is being waged not by political means but simply by using its place in the existing state system.

Perhaps the students will still play a role in this struggle and demand an accounting from the conciliation commission. But... the apparatus is still the ruling apparatus, and the students will no longer enjoy the national support that they did during the hunger strike. The outburst of emotion has died away...

No matter what many of our student leaders may be saying, today only one thing is absolutely clear, namely, that the Ukrainian hunger strike was the apex in the development of the student movement. Unfortunately, all the historical experience of our state shows that only this kind of highest tribute forces the authorities to "relax the regime of containment." They particularly do not stand on ceremony with adults here, but if the suicides are not yet 20 years old, then society makes the choice.

During the events in the Ukrainian parliament we often heard words to the effect that the students were nothing more than puppets in the hands of Rukh and the other democratic opposition, and that they were being given money by the West. But the rules of evidence were offensively simple: The students did not make one single demand affecting just the students. Everything they were saying had already been said by the democrats.

Of course things like this were said. As they were 20 years ago, and 100 years ago, and 200 years ago. And as the well-read Ukrainian students told us, the slogan of the French revolution—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—was used 50 years before the revolution itself, in the constitution of the military clerk and hetman of Mazepa, Filipp Orlik.

But if we try to forget about the action in October we are sure that the student movement will have to speak out much more harshly than the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Because for many of them the result is not all that important. It is the action that is important. Or, if worse comes to worst, a parody of it. In an autumn warmed by the triumph of the colleges of Kiev, students in Moscow also tied white bands on their heads and went to the Kremlin, and organized a hunger strike. True, it was by way of warning, and it lasted only a day. What can be said about that day of letting off steam?

It can be said that in progressive circles it is acceptable to talk about our student body only in ecstatic tones, and that this flattery does them much harm. It can be said that our student body is learning little, and learning it poorly, and that anyone who really loves them should not use elevated motives of a sociopolitical character to explain what is quite often explained by poor culture of the mind and will, moral slovenliness, and the habit of phrase-mongering. They take all their ideas from the newspapers and accept them on faith. And when they encounter gross physical rebuff they surrender and yield, hiding their retreat with some kind of ringing phrases such as "the student body is prepared to fight."

However, we have quoted enough. Because now we have started using word for word the reproaches expressed in the anthology "VEKHI" addressed to the student body as long ago as 1909 by Aleksandr Izgoyev, a sociologist and political commentator and leader of the cadets of the right. Let us remember that we are now in 1991. And it is hardly worth recalling the dozens of student organizations that have collapsed since the first peremptory cry of the college administrations. Likewise the informal student leaders who have exchanged their student cards for the credentials of the obkom [oblast committee] party worker, and the loud statements about action—most of it symbolic—by our student body. And without this we understand that the times of Bulgakov's professor, Preobrazhenskiy, for whom the words "I am a Moscow student" was some kind of moral criterion, a measure of action, have gone forever.

Or almost, because, given all its defects and miscalculations, the Ukrainian Student Union does nevertheless exist, and it has succeeded in moving away from that eternal call of our students—"Give!"—and the history of the "student criminal case" showed, even before Vilnius and Riga, that the same Izgoyev could have been totally mistaken.

No, we are not setting up a slaughterhouse in Lithuania, and the arrest of Oles Doniy cannot be put on a par with that, but we are certain that they are links in the same chain. And Izgoyev, who after the rights and freedoms conceded on 17 October 1905 announced that the time of the revolutionary student body was over and that now "society demands something else of it, namely, the ability to work, and moral restraint," was wrong just the same. For us, the time of the revolutionary student body is, unfortunately, only just beginning. And who knows, if the Kiev hunger strike becomes just the latest act in a highly moral protest against the possibility of dictatorship, perhaps all is not yet lost.

Meanwhile... Meanwhile, they have still preferred to release Oles Doniy. After his refusal to write a "confession" and the long attempts to persuade him to help the investigation, they extracted from him a promise not to go out again, and they returned to him all the things that they had taken during the search. And then they closed his "personal" file. But as they reported in the procurator's office, in the end the case regarding the seizure of the university building by students has not been closed. Thirty people have been subpoenaed...

Caucasus

Armenians Call for End to Azerbaijan Conflict

LD3101201891 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku January 31 TASS—A call for reconciliation and an end to the inter-ethnic conflict was made today by a group of Armenians from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region in Azerbaijan.

Among 122 signatories of the address to the Azeri people published here today are war, labour and Communist Party veterans, people of different trades and professions, who joined to form an inter-ethnic reconciliation committee.

"For three years already we have been drinking from the bitter cup of human suffering. An open discussion of our life, pain and anxiety for the destiny of native Karabakh is long overdue," the address says.

"Armenians and Azers have lived as good neighbours in Karabakh for centuries. They have always supported each other and shared their last crumb. But today, fires are shot on this ancient land and sorrow has invaded every house," the address says.

"Armenians have lost much more than they have gained in the inter-ethnic conflict. We sincerely yearn for reconciliation," the address stresses. "At Least 70 per cent of Armenians in Nagorno- Karabakh share the sentiment," it says.

Armenians Urge Azerbaijanis for Peace in NKAO

NC3101215591 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 31 Jan 91

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The Armenians in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] have made an appeal to the

people of Azerbaijan. The appeal, which has been published in KOMMUNIST and BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, said:

We have been in grief for the past three years. Our life has been ruined. The time to discuss [words indistinct] for the future of the NKAO has come to pass. We have been disheartened and exhausted with grief. We have been frustrated by what has taken place and by the social problems.

All honest Armenians are convinced that those who have been carried away by the idea of warrior-like behavior have betrayed the good-neighborly traditions our forefathers left for us as a legacy. The Armenians and the Azerbaijanis have lived as good neighbors in the NKAO, held each other's hands, and shared the [word indistinct] for centuries. However, shots are being fired on this ancient land, and each and every house has suffered a disastrous experience.

The authors of the appeal expressed the opinion that they believe that the people will see the true faces of the (?instigators) of the freedom movement, who have become butchers of human beings, and realize (?who are) the national heroes.

The appeal said: We sincerely say, and we write this appeal in the same way, that our families and close relatives are aware of this appeal. We, as war, work, and party veterans and as members of various professions, have joined the Interethnic Peace Committee in the NKAO. We confirm that at least 70 percent of the Armenians are of the same opinion. The remaining Armenians are also [words indistinct]. However, they are afraid to disclose this. We are living among the people. In view of this, we are aware of what they feel in their hearts.

Do not criticize us for asking you not to disclose our names for the time being. [Passage indistinct] We must wage a joint struggle for peace in the NKAO.

The appeal was signed by 122 Armenians in the NKAO.

Economic, Ethnic 'Tension' in Stepanakert Viewed

LD0502001191 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 4 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert February 4 TASS—A rare snowfall covered Stepanakert, but could not soften the tension in the regional centre of Nagorno-Karabakh. Economic crimes and inter-ethnic clashes have become frequent in the region.

For four days running, residents of Stepanakert have been without water and without central heating, due to a diversion at the water-main. The water-main is being repaired under protection of Interior Ministry troops.

An Azerbaijani and four Armenians were killed in the region last week. Two of them were killed on Sunday by unidentified persons dressed in police uniforms.

Interior Ministry troops are taking measures to ensure public order, but they are insufficient. Political methods should be used to resolve the problem.

From the beginning of 1991, 22 people have been killed in Nagorno-Karabakh and neighbouring regions of Azerbaijan.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Rejects Decree on Patrols

NC0202042991 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Excerpts] The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium met on 31 January under the chairmanship of Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

The presidium examined and then adopted decisions concerning the appointment of directors for several departments in the Supreme Soviet secretariat.

Ktrich Sardaryan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers, put forward the government's proposal on the appointment of a plenipotentiary representative in Artashatskiy rayon. The Supreme Soviet concured with the government to appoint Tatevos Tatevosyan as the government's plenipotentiary representative in Artashatskiy rayon. [passage omitted]

The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium also decided to suspend implementation on Republic territory of the 29 December 90 decisions of the USSR defense and internal affairs ministers stipulating joint patrols of major cities by workers of the internal affairs ministry organs and servicemen of the Soviet Army and Navy. The [Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium] decision was made in view of the fact that the joint patrols of the capitals and other settlement areas in the union republics by the troops and workers of the internal affairs ministry organs as of 1 February 1991 is unconstitutional, and its implementation might endanger the course of sociopolitical stability in the republic.

Armenian, Soviet Army Officials Negotiating Draft

NC0402115291 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Many people are interested in the status of conscription in Armenia and wonder if the 17 October 1990 Armenian Supreme Soviet decision on conscription of Armenian citizens for 1990 has been fulfilled.

Vazgen Sargisyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet's Standing Commission on Defense and Internal Affairs and acting chairman of the Committee for the Coordination of the Activities of the Military Departments, in reply to our correspondent's question, noted that talks were already held with the republic's civil

defense staffers, military commissariat, and directors of the military faculties at the higher educational institutes, and an important meeting was held yesterday with General Pishchev, commander of the Soviet troops stationed in Armenia. Vazgen Sargisyan noted: On the same day Armenian Prime Minister Vazgen Manukyan cabled USSR Defense Minister Yazov asking for the opening of a military academy in Armenia and for the deployment of some of the draftees in the disaster zone in line with a previously reached agreement.

Armenian-American Named to Supreme Soviet Post

NC0402163891 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 2 Feb 91

[Text] The Information and Analysis Department [irazekman yev verlutsutyan bazhin] of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet is called upon to play an important role in providing the parliament with scientifically corroborated analysis and information. The department will cooperate with the scientists and specialists in the republic and abroad to create the necessary information infrastructure in Armenia and abroad and will thus help make the work of the Supreme Soviet commissions and individual people's deputies more productive.

By a decision of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, Dr. Zhirayr Liparityan, Armenian-American historian and political scientist and former director of Boston's Zorian Institute for Research and Documentation of Contemporary Armenian Affairs, has been appointed the director of the aforesaid department on a contractual basis.

Armenian TV Becomes 'Full Associate' of CNN

NC0402180891 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] Yerevan, 1 Feb (ARMENPRES)—Armenian television has become a full associate of the CNN international news network.

Viewers of U.S. cable television have already seen special three- minute broadcasts transmitted from the republic. So have millions of television viewers in Canada, Europe and in the eastern part of our country through satellite connections. The initiative for cooperation between the international television program and Armenian television [came from] the Armenian General Benevolent Union's Washington-based Armenian News Service.

Azerbaijani Seeks Republic-Center Balance

PM2901130991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Chairman Elmira Kafarova by correspondent Colonel V. Kaushanskiy; place, date not given: "Union Treaty— View From Republics. Truth Is Born in Dialogue"]

[Text] Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Chairman Elmira Kafarova answers our correspondent's questions.

[Kaushanskiy] Elmira Mikailovna, the spectrum of public opinion in the republic concerning the Union Treaty's fate is quite wide. As I found out for myself by talking to people, it ranges from categorical refusal to live under the same roof to unconditional agreement. But nonetheless I formed the impression that the political barometer in Azerbaijan shows a steady "for."

[Kafarova] You are not mistaken. Azerbaijan made its choice in 1922 and does not intend to change it. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then. Three constitutions were adopted, and each consistently declared our republics' sovereignty. What is happening over the treaty today is a struggle for genuine and not proclaimed sovereignty, for real and not paper rights. And this is fundamental. Yes, my compatriots, despite differing and at times polarized viewpoints—which is entirely normal—are nevertheless voting "for" a renewed Union.

Let us recall that Azerbaijan has obtained much during the years of Soviet power. The key corps of doctors and engineers in all leading industrial spheres was formed virtually anew. We are indebted to the Union for this. Our envoys have studied in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and other cities. I think that a very high standard of knowledge has been obtained which has enabled the scientific and technical intelligentsia to be cultivated, has enabled them to create their own textbooks, and much else. Although at times we lost out in achieving this standard. After all, what happened: Many of our cadres mastered the Russian language beautifully but completely forgot their native language—Azerbajani. It started to fall into decline because you can hardly grow green shoots from dried roots. Such an imbalance will be eliminated in the next few years. I favor bilingualism, but only when a native language becomes the tree of spirituality, the rebirth of the richest national culture.

But let us be honest to the end: Azerbaijan has taken much from the Union, but has also given it much. Our oil is the country's "gold reserve." In the war years three tanks out of four and as many aircraft were fueled with it. I heard from cosmonauts that Baku oil is a component of space fuel. In a word, our destinies have become so intertwined that they cannot be separated. Political dialogue which will bring about a correction to future mutual relations with the center is needed. We favor such a dialogue.

[Kaushanskiy] It is no secret that some political leaders think that it is perfectly adequate to build relations between republics horizontally, missing the center out. They say that by doing this the lion's share of the budget will go on, so to speak, domestic consumption. But it is not star wars but budget wars that are starting to debilitate the already ailing economic organism. So just where, in your opinion, is the border beyond which, as in

the ancient proverb, the things which are Caesar's will be rendered unto Caesar, and the things that are God's will be rendered unto God.

[Kafarova] It is, of course, necessary to agree on horizontal ties. Any ban or stricture will certainly cause a counteraction. Horizontal ties are the keys to sovereignty and it is not worth opposing this—which, incidentally, even the center has understood. Republics will develop these ties, but somebody also has to represent in the international arena that united, powerful state with which the West will only deal. Otherwise what will happen: We will be 15 republics plus 20 autonomous formations which want to call themselves the subjects of a federation. Who speaks for whom? The interminable splitting up of the Union can only weaken the country and cannot strengthen it in any way. It is very important to find an exact balance between what is Caesar's and what is God's.

Azerbaijan, for example, is actively seeking a way of obtaining foreign currency through its own noncentralized channels. A treaty has been concluded with Australia. This country's aircraft will land at Baku, be refueled with our fuel, and serviced by our specialists. Payment will be in hard currency. The process of concluding treaties with neighbors—Turkey and Iraq—is going on. What will come out of this—only time will tell. Everything is learned by comparison, by a critical view of things. So they used to suggest to us: The best technologies are in the West, hurry up and buy them. But if, say, the Ukraine's potential exceeds the potential of some foreign state severalfold and its scientific developments are valuable to Azerbaijan, why should we not develop contacts in the technological sphere with the Ukrainians and buy innovations needed by us from them for hard-earned rubles?

[Kaushanskiy] However, we are again talking more about horizontal ties, leaving in the background the rights delegated to the center.

[Kafarova] I will not be original here and will support those of my colleagues who have included global questions of foreign economic ties, the country's defense, state security, space research, and the development of all basic types of communications in the ambit of the center's powers. We simply need Union currency reserves as well. But not in order to gobble them up, as we are successfully doing, but to invest in sectors without which we cannot stand on our feet on a unionwide scale, as befits a great power. Metallurgy, for instance, or the reworking of programs with the aid of which the republics really can be helped.

Have you seen what the land of Apsheron [peninsula of Azerbaijan projecting into Caspian Sea] has turned into? It has become completely worthless after such a massive amount of oil has been pumped out of it. Meanwhile back in 1945 Stalin put his signature to a document which gave us the resources to recultivate the land. After that there was another series of similar pieces of paper. But things just didn't get off the ground. The republic is not in a position to cope with such a mass of work alone. Here you also have a purely Union problem requiring huge investments.

And the formulation of the Union budget must be approached with the greatest state responsibility, having cast aside, as I see it, purely populist ambitions. The illusion should not be created that today, in an age of integration, we can survive on our own. The country should not be ruined. What are we spending the resources on? On long-term construction projects? On tanks which we then successfully send to be melted down? The signing of a new Union Treaty is also a clear understanding of the fact that there has been enough living by theories of belt-tightening in the name of a future increase in the welfare of Soviet man. As regards the budget and the finer points of its formulation—we will talk about this in detail at the February session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet.

[Kaushanskiy] In Baku, in Yerevan, and in Tbilisi I repeatedly heard about the idea of a united Caucasian home. It is also being discussed with varying frequency against the background of parliamentary squabbling over the Union Treaty. But today the Caucasian home—forgive me for the comparison—reminds me rather of a hostel in which the common kitchen cannot be shared. Is it realistic to talk of creating such a structure at such a troubled time?

[Kafarova] We are drawn to each other by economics, culture, panhuman ties, and a certain psychological mold of our way of life. We—Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan—were often an example of good-neighborliness and how to get on with each other. The Transcaucasian Federation also existed in our joint history. And also in Khrushchev's time the Transcaucasian National Economic Council. Having common borders, we have also experienced common disasters in the last three years. And we must think about how to return to the original state in the same three-year period. We ourselves have facilitated a great deal and we ourselves have indulged a great deal—I mean the center's uncertain position on those questions when it was necessary, as they say, to exercise authority. So far the Caucasian home looks too hypothetical to me; the real conditions for creating it have not yet been created. Relations are too strained.

[Kaushanskiy] And there are too many deadlocks in them, if we are talking about relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia. Is there, in your view, a way out of this sprawling labyrinth?

[Kafarova] Undoubtedly. I already said at the congress that the Karabakh problem is purely an Azerbaijani problem. Armenia did not interfere in it for seven decades, and we lived peacefully. But anticonstitutional acts appeared which were not condemned by the center as they should have been. And events began to take on a threatening nature. Just remember the act on the joining

of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to Armenia, elections of deputies from the autonomous oblast...

I will say frankly that the Azerbaijani people have serious doubts that the republic's sovereign rights will be observed in accordance with the USSR Constitution. It will hardly be possible to sign the Union Treaty without dotting the i's and crossing the t's on the Karabakh problem. If the center really wants to preserve the Union it must react completely unambiguously to any attempts to violate the territorial integrity of our republic and of republics in general. Otherwise from now on we will have what we have now—rampant separatism. Note that nevertheless we firmly decided not to embark on eliminating the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's autonomy, despite the prompting, including that of deputies. In our view, this is a road to nowhere.

[Kaushanskiy] And lastly. Construction of defensive installations has begun in Azerbaijan's border oblasts. A five-km zone with all the attributes of a border is being created. Azerbaijani soldiers drafted into the Army are also taking part in these works. What is the next step? The creation of its own national army? But, as far as I know, the republic leadership is not planning such measures.

[Kafarova] Up to today, at any rate, it has been so. But the following situation could develop. If the Union does not very soon take the most decisive measures to disarm bandit formations, we will be put in the position of having to defend ourselves by ourselves. The following has already been repeatedly heard in the Supreme Soviet: Why don't we create our own army? Why were militants in Armenia virtually legalized under the auspices of their armed forces, while we dither? At the very same session at which the question of creating a five-km zone along the republic border was resolved, I stated: We are being protected by the Union—the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and Army subunits. But if we feel that we are becoming defenseless, then the problem of self-defense arises—in all its magnitude.

Today we do not think it possible to have a national army. On the contrary, we are suggesting to Armenia the erection of such a zone to provide us with the capability to monitor who is entering the neighboring territory and for what reason and with what intentions. Why does the person coming have grenades, flamethrowers, automatic weapons, and helicopters—this is precisely the arsenal with which they visit us as "guests."

The Azerbaijanis are a patient and law-abiding people. That section of draftees which we are leaving at home is nevertheless under the control of the USSR Ministry of Defense, and not an independent [samodeyatelnyy] military leadership. But everything in this world has a beginning and an end. If we say that we are delegating the defense function to the Union, then I repeat that we are counting on firm guarantees of the protection of sovereignty. It is time to understand once and for all that any attempt to redraw the intra-union borders will turn into boundless interethnic discord.

Ossetian Deputy, Georgian Extremists Arrested

PM0502112991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Feb 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Semenyaka under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Night Shootout"]

[Text] Tskhinvali, 31 Jan—Georgian militia staffers' illegal actions in relation to North Ossetian People's Deputy T. Kolumbekov and his arrest during a journey from the oblast center to the city of Gori aroused the indignation of local inhabitants of Ossetian nationality. They are insisting on the immediate release of the people's deputy.

At a spontaneous rally many speakers demanded that Internal Troops servicemen take decisive action to release T. Kolumbekov. There were calls to seize hostages of Georgian nationality.

During a meeting servicemen and public representatives managed to defuse the tension threatening to spill over into mass violations of public order and to persuade those assembled to desist from rash acts.

And another thing. At midnight an Internal Troops line-unit detail discovered obstacles on the road from the oblast center to the inhabited locality of Tamarasheni. The servicemen came under fire while they were clearing them. They managed to arrest four gunmen. They turned out to be Georgian extremists. During the arrest a Kalashnikov improved assault rifle, two carbines, a revolver, ammunition for them, and five grenades were confiscated from the attackers.

None of the servicemen was injured.

Georgian Government Law To Trim Soviet Role

PM0402145391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by Besik Urigashvili under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Draft Law on Local Self-Management"]

[Text] Tbilisi—A draft law on local self-management has been published in the republic newspapers. It proposes transferring all power locally to prefects who will be appointed by the Supreme Soviet.

According to the draft law, local soviets are allocated protocol functions. In these conditions it becomes pointless for the opposition to participate in elections. Professor Guram Machaidze, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Georgia, declared this on television. He pointed out that reducing the role of the soviets to the level of a consultative organ will hardly serve the cause of true democracy. He expressed the hope that the draft law will undergo substantial changes during the discussion. Otherwise Georgian Social Democrats will hardly

deem it possible to participate in elections. Municipal elections will take place in Georgia this March.

Gamsakhurdia Says Armed Patrols Unacceptable

AU0502105691 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 1 Feb 91 p 3

[Interview with Georgian President Zviyad Gamsakhurdia by Csaba Szerdahelyi; place, date not given: "Moscow's Economic Blockade Against Georgia—Tbilisi Will Fight If Forced To"—first paragraph is NEPSZAVA introduction]

[Text] World attention is focused on the Gulf and the Baltics; in the meantime, Moscow is unable to decide on the measures it should take. Gorbachev has completely lost faith, while the Army and the KGB are increasingly gaining ground, precisely as a result of the presidential decree, Zviyad Gamsakhurdia said in an interview with NEPSZAVA.

[Szerdahelyi] Joint military and police patrols will be introduced in the main Soviet cities from 1 February. How does Tbilisi react to this?

[Gamsakhurdia] We can only have one reaction: The Armed Forces of the Soviet power will not patrol the streets in Georgia! At the moment, Georgia is living through a transitional period. However, we still have a long way to go to full independence and secession from the Soviet Union. Both our parliament and government are prepared for the tasks, and the Georgian people are on the alert to avoid a situation similar to that in 1956. I think I do not have to explain this to you, Hungarians.

[Szerdahelyi] What will you do if these patrols are nevertheless introduced?

[Gamsakhurdia] I stress once again: This cannot happen. This step on Moscow's part would lead to open civil war. However, the recent decision of the Georgian Parliament to set up a National Guard within weeks was not made in this spirit. Their main task would be to fight against crime, and they would closely cooperate with the police.

[Szerdahelyi] What forces are you talking about?

[Gamsakhurdia] There would be 12,000 people in the National Guard; the police currently has 20,000 men. Naturally, if necessary, these people would fight the intruders.

[Szerdahelyi] Do you intend to militarize Georgia?

[Gamsakhurdia] On the contrary! We are for disarmament and the withdrawal of Soviet troops, but we have the right to self defense. For example, the police forces will cover the mass demonstration against the introduction of the aforementioned patrols, a demonstration scheduled in Tbilisi on 1 February.

[Szerdahelyi] Is it possible that Moscow will regroup its forces? The withdrawal of paratroopers has begun in the Baltics.

[Gamsakhurdia] I do not believe in the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltic, but it seems certain that, following the Baltic states, Georgia would be the next to be hit by enemy troops. The Kremlin has already threatened us with various ultimatums. For instance, according to the Kremlin, we should provide 30,000 young men for the Soviet Army this year, but we will not give them any young man. We only allowed the Georgians currently serving in the Army to finish their armed service. Obviously very few people in Hungary heard about the fact that Moscow introduced various economic sanctions against Georgia beginning with December 1990. We hardly get any fuel, natural gas, coal, and raw materials.

[Szerdahelyi] What about South Ossetia which is also struggling for independence? Its 160,000 people are also in revolt.

[Gamsakhurdia] This territory is an organic part of Georgia, unlike Georgia being part of the Soviet Union, because the Soviets annexed Georgia by military force in 1921. Nobody subjugated the Ossetians. Unfortunately, the mood continues to be tense in South Ossetia, and recent confrontations claimed several victims. All this does not serve Georgia's interests because we are a peace-loving people.

Paper Views Georgian Moves on Draft, Government

PM0402152791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Feb 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Colonel V. Kaushanskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Mr. Prefects, Mr. Guardsmen"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 31 Jan—Maybe the very last session of the republic Supreme Soviet dotted the i's and crossed the t's on military questions, even on the official level depriving the Ministry of Defense of the prospect of drafting Georgian youths into the Soviet Army. The brief reports on this from Tbilisi are already well known. Now for the details. By a decision of parliament, as early as spring this year there will be a draft of youths who have reached 18 years into the internal troops—into a national guard. To this end draft commissions will be formed on the republic's territory within two months.

Relevant instructions regarding this have also been issued to the republic military commissariat, despite the fact that it is a subdivision of the USSR Ministry of Defense and does not fall under the Georgian Supreme Soviet's jurisdiction.

One of the parliamentary resolution's points runs as follows: To comply with the request of servicemen who have quit the Soviet Army's ranks and to enlist them in the ranks of the internal troops—the national guard. As a matter of fact this is where any references to an

all-Union army end. Instead the documents adopted by parliament list the guardsmen's rights and duties in full detail. Those of both enlisted personnel and officers. The wording of the military oath, ending with the words "God is with us!" has been approved. Military ranks and duties have been approved—from squad leader to commander in chief.

It is not yet clear who will arm the force that is being set up or who will train it and in what specialties.

Among other basic documents parliament also adopted the "Law on Local Government in the Transitional Period" at the session. The concepts of a prefect, prefectures, and a council [uprava] sound somewhat strange to our ears. But they have indeed become a new addition to Georgia's political lexicon concerning local self-government organizations. A prefect's powers are extremely wide. In essence he is lord and master of the rayon and city administration, the running of which involves questions of state, economic, and social and cultural organization. With the agreement of higher organs he is empowered to appoint and release from duties employees of the prefecture, enterprises, institutions, and organizations; to form his own cabinet; to issue permission for economic activity; to allocate the budget; and much else.

And one more substantial detail. The prefect is appointed with the agreement of the republic Council of Ministers on the basis of a representation by the Supreme Soviet chairman. The last point caused indignation from representatives of the opposition, which saw it as the road to a dictatorship under Z. Gamsakhurdia because people from his team will occupy the prefect's chair. The opposition even organized a railroad-track picket at Samtredia station for a few hours, delaying the movement of trains. It is an irony of fate that in the summer supporters of the "roundtable" headed by Z. Gamsakhurdia picketed the very same stretch of railroad, demanding publication of their version of the law on elections in the press and the speediest calling of a republic Supreme Soviet session.

However, the local government organs, elections to which are scheduled for 31 March this year, are an exclusively internal matter. But what is to be done with the draft into the Army? Even if no account is taken of the opinion of local skeptics, who say that our lads ran away from Yazov so they will run away from Gamsakhurdia too.

Georgian Body Leader Disputes 'Vremya' Report

LD0202225591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2045 GMT 2 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A telegram from Tbilisi arrived at the editorial office today. Professor Dzhaba Ioseliani, its author, leader of the Mkhedrioni Georgian patriotic organization, asks us to inform our television audience of the following: The report on the Mkhedrioni organization's participation in the events [not further identified] in Tskhinvali, South Ossetia, broadcast in a "Vremya" program on 29 January, does not correspond to reality. The Mkhedrioni leadership categorically denies the presence and participation of members of the organization in those events. This is our fundamental and well-known position, the telegram of the Mkhedrioni leaders says.

'Closed' Georgian Paper To Reopen With New Name

PM3001121391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 1

[Report by N. Mikeladze: "Disliked and Dangerous"]

[Text] Some good news and some bad news. The newspaper MOLODEZH GRUZII [GEORGIA YOUTH] is no more. But the rumors of its death are grossly exaggerated. The editorial office is operating and an issue will come out on Friday as usual. Admittedly it will be under a different name. Henceforth it will be the independent weekly NOVAYA GAZETA [NEW NEWSPAPER]. The TASS story about the youth paper being closed down and merged with ZARYA VOSTOKA turned out to be not quite accurate.

The guys have already gotten used to being labeled and they are used to "not being liked." They were not liked by the stagnated leadership. They angered General Rodionov. "MOLODEZH GRUZII is the most malicious newspaper," he said at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. And, finally, they do not suit some of the "new democrats"...

"...The newspaper MOLODEZH GRUZII was the 'undercover' mouthpiece of the USSR KGB and the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League], and not an independent newspaper. It never reflected the interests of Georgian young people and it published provocative articles which hindered the national liberation movement of the Georgian people and helped inflame interethnic hostility." These are excerpts from a statement by the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet press center in which the youth newspaper was called an antidemocratic newspaper.

Such is the transient nature of fame. The support the newspaper gave to the emergent forces of democracy has been forgotten. And finally the newspaper's closure and the real battles for it involving Politburo members during the April tragedy in Tbilisi have also been forgotten... Why?

The recent policy of the youth newspaper has differed from the line of the official majority. The newspaper contrived to let everyone air their views, but alas it did not manage to be liked by everyone. And this is dangerous.

But the newspaper is alive. The Georgian Government has registered the weekly. "We are not parting from our readers," the journalists said, speaking for the last time

under the "sign" of MOLODEZH GRUZII. "The name has changed, but not the principles."

Georgia's Supreme Soviet Newspaper Renamed

AU0102101691 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0500 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] ZARYA VOSTOKA is changing its name. As of today, the new paper of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia is called VESTNIK GRUZII.

Transcaucasus 'Mothers' Rally' on Conscript Life

PM0502111391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel V. Kaushanskiy: "Direct Link—Mothers' Rally"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 30 Jan—For two days and two nights snowfalls had cut off Batumi, where a rally of Transcaucasus soldiers' mothers was to take place. All that time they waited for the chance to fly out aboard planes provided by the General Staff. But the rally, which was an initiative of the Transcaucasus Military District Military Council, was held after all.

This has already been reported briefly in the press, but today we give the floor to Lieutenant General A. Skoryy, member of the Military Council and chief of the Transcaucasus Military District Political Directorate:

"The idea to convene a forum for soldiers' mothers was generated by life itself. I'm not going to talk about the heated passions surrounding the draft campaign last year and indeed this year in this region; that is well known to everyone. In spite of the rampant anti-Army sentiments, we set ourselves the aim of calling the mothers and wives to a frank debate and really showing them the kind of conditions in which young men whom we draft not only from Transcaucasia but from other regions too have to discharge their duty to the motherland. We did not hide anything. The women inspected barracks, messrooms, guardroom premises, and clubs. Unique newsreel footage of the military district's history was shown. They were all able to see for themselves that, no matter how people claiming to have a 'democratic outlook' on servicemen's life may inflame emotions around the Army, the Army itself has always been and remains not a mythical force supposedly sent by the Kremlin to put down the national movement in the Transcaucasus but a factor in the stabilization of the situation and the political settlement of conflicts. In their speeches not only mothers but also fathers of servicemen, including those who had seen wartime service, bore this out. By the way, the men came on their own initiative. It was not only in Batumi that a frank debate took place. Those who could not get to the city owing to the bad weather met, with our assistance, in Baku and Yerevan. We all yet again satisfied ourselves as to the most important thing: The core of a patriotic upbringing is consolidated in the home. Much depends on how capable we older people prove of instilling in our progeny respect for the laws of the country, its Constitution, and the most honorable profession for a man of defending the motherland. And we were understood correctly."

Central Asia

'Vremya' Carries Profile of Kirghiz President

LD0402233191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Feb 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The first 100 days of the presidency of Aksar Akayev in the Republic of Kirghizstan elapse today. According to sociologists, the election of 46-year-old physicist Aksar Akayev—head of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences and member of the CPSU Central Committee—as president of the republic meets with the approval of more than 67 percent of those polled, with 8 percent against. His first actions: dialogue with the political hunger strikers who were picketing parliament—the hunger strike has been ended; a decree on lifting the curfew in Frunze; a decree on the free transfer of housing to invalids and war veterans; a new name for the republic—Kirghizstan, without the words soviet and socialist; a declaration on sovereignty; the restoration of two former oblasts, and the formation of two new ones: decrees on indexing the incomes of the population and social security for citizens in the low-income bracket, and on protecting consumer interests; radical reforms of the power structure—for the first time in the country state administration and local self-government are being delineated on a legislative basis: and a sharp reduction in the average age of the leadership. [Akayev] Literally the other day a session of the republican Supreme Soviet set up a new Cabinet of ministers, which, it seems to me, actually serves this aim, and probably addresses on a priority basis the task of consolidating all sections of society and all the peoples living in our republic, because there are currently in the Cabinet of Ministers Kirghiz, Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, and Jews. We are now bringing in a representative of the Uzbek nationality. I think that all of this will, finally, lead to consolidation, to interethnic accord and tranquility in the republic, and that it will form a basis for finally getting down to resolving economic problems and issues concerning social support for our population. I would say that we have also taken a number of steps which have made it possible to further stabilize and improve the situation in Osh Oblast following the well-known tragedy in the summer of last year.

Masaliyev Wants Kyrgyzstan's Old Name Restored

PM0402131991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jan 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Ryabushin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Politburo Member Revises Parliament Decisions"]

[Text] Frunze—A. Masaliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee here, has demanded that parliament return to Kyrgyzstan its former name and restore the words "Soviet" and "Socialist."

He proposed that a referendum be held on this question and that the recently adopted Declaration on Republic State Sovereignty be de facto revised.

Defending his position, the party organization chief said that these were the first steps taken in the Baltic Republics. They also took away the words Soviet and socialist. And then they went further. And today they are fighting for withdrawal from the Soviet Union. But the view of the 28th CPSU Congress is to preserve the USSR.

President A. Akayev also participated in the discussion.

I would not dwell in detail on this ideological problem," he stated, "if it were not for one highly significant circumstance. It is obvious to me that by provoking arguments at this difficult time about matters that have nothing to do with the real interests of the republic's people, the zealous defenders of 'ideological purity' in the republic's appellation want to lead us astray from the chosen path and from resolving urgent economic and social problems."

Other deputies defending various viewpoints also took part in the discussion. Once again there was a division among the deputies in a parliament that had recently united its forces and implemented a number of important decisions.

The question of the political hunger strike of B. Ryspayev, former chairman of the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, was removed from the agenda. The POSTFAKTUM agency had reported on it. To be precise, Ryspayev had not begun his action, he had only spoken about it at the microphone.

BAYKONUR Newspaper Launched in Leninsk

PM0402155191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent G. Dildyayev: "BAYKONUR Launched"]

[Text] The first issue of the newspaper BAYKONUR has been published in the cosmonauts' city of Leninsk. It is the publication of the city soviet of people's deputies. The main topic for the new newspaper will not be red-letter reports about rocket launches but life in a city which is pretentiously described as a "space port" yet is staggeringly poor in amenities against the backdrop of these launches.